

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

SEPTEMBER, 1846.

ART. I.—RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY TO
REFORM.

An Address delivered before the Ministerial Conference in Boston,
May 27, 1846. By Rev. EDWARD B. HALL.

SUMMONED at a late hour to prepare something for this occasion, I take a subject suggested by the times, but belonging to all time ; — the Relation of the Christian Ministry to individual and social Reform ; or more simply, the Christian Principle of Reform.

There is no special satisfaction in speaking of that which is on every one's lips, has all variety of definitions, and finds a multitude of advocates or opposers equally confident and mutually distrustful ; most distrustful perhaps of any one who takes what is called a moderate course, and what has come to be considered no course at all. But there is a satisfaction in even the humblest endeavor to discern first principles, and keep to them, on subjects where principle is so apt to be thrust aside by passion, and that which is most needed is least in favor — discrimination with decision.

First principles, on the subject before us and all kindred subjects, are to be found in the Gospel of Christ ; — a very simple fact, but one important enough, and enough neglect-

ed, to stand as the chief position. The present inquiry pertains directly to the Gospel, and the ministers of the Gospel; but if it did not, the position would be the same, and essential. A Christian community may be presumed to come under the Christian dispensation. Every Christian age is to be judged by the Christian standard, as to its government, its church, society, and individuals. It had been better for all, if this rule had been applied to all ages since Christ came. It might have prevented some of their own errors and iniquities, and might at least have saved subsequent ages, and the present, from much of the foolish talk about the 'character of the age' being made the rule, and the only rule of judgment. As if a people, whatever their religion or opportunity, may be as bad as they will, and their very badness shall be the rule by which they are to be judged; a kind of reasoning, that has been made to cover a larger multitude of sins, than the largest charity. But whatever may be thought of the past, we are clear as to the present. The nineteenth Christian century is late enough to make it safe to say, that the Christian law is to be supreme; and that any principle of individual or social action which contravenes that law, is self-condemned. How this is to be determined, in any particular case, is a part of the inquiry which I cannot pursue; except to say, that if individual minds and consciences are not competent to decide, there is not, there never has been, and there never can be, a competent tribunal on the earth. The attempt, in State or Church, to find a tribunal which does not consist of individual opinions and involve individual accountability, — the idea of an irresponsible and infallible judgment to be found in some body of men, or some one man, near or remote, — is beyond my power of comprehension, and therefore of discussion. I am content to take the simple fact, that the principles which are to guide us, the first, indisputable, and universal principles of Reform, are to be found in the Gospel of Christ.

From this position, common and indefinite as it may seem, important inferences might be drawn. The following are the most obvious and pertinent. That every reform must stand on the Christian basis; that every reformer is amenable to the Christian law; that every individual is bound to use Christian motives and means, for his own and

others' highest improvement; that every evil is to be adjudged an evil, according to its violation of the Christian law, or its distance from it, and the obstacles it interposes; that for the removal of all evils, we are required to use Christian means, and forbidden to use unchristian means; that we are personally accountable, to some degree, for the prevalence of those evils, to which we have failed to apply Christian truth and influence, and are not accountable at all, where we have applied them faithfully, however ineffectually.

These several points need not be separately considered. They may be comprised within the general statement, that Christianity proposes the reform of all moral evils; and that our responsibility in this work relates to means and efforts, rather than results. These truths I am the more willing to urge here, from the persuasion that they affect our whole position and duty as ministers, without reference to times or special objects.

Christianity proposes reform; reform, in the Scriptural sense of inward regeneration, and in the highest sense of personal, social, universal progress toward perfection. This is so self-evident, that one would feel ashamed to assert and attempt to show it, but for facts which intimate a forgetfulness, if not a denial, of the statement. Few facts stand out more boldly on the front of Christian history, than a disposition to take men and things as they are, on the presumption that they either need not or cannot be changed. There would seem to have grown up with Christianity itself (though before, it was never wanting) a kind of *acquiescence* in the evils of society and character, as well as in the events of life. This, as time has advanced, has been confirmed by the very antiquity of evil, and by that reverence for antiquity, which, with all the truth and usefulness that belong to it, often magnifies one part of the Apostle's injunction, "hold fast that which is good," so as to lose even the thought of the other and the first, "prove all things." It is not extravagant to say, that that in which all Christians of all ages and sects have most agreed, has been an absolute faith in "necessary evils"; an expression, which of itself is as likely to confound as to convey truth. But our quarrel is not with words. The evils usually covered by the phrase in question will be found, I think,

to be nearly all the evils that exist. Sin, in all its Protean forms, with all its direct and indirect effects; the passions and appetites, in every degree of indulgence and violence; human nature, in its total depravity or inordinate selfishness, with every manifestation — wrath, cruelty, revenge, murder, fraud, licentiousness, drunkenness, slavery, and that most, which best expresses, because it creates and comprises all, war; — these all have been specially marked as “necessary.” But these are the very evils, whether as causes or effects, which Christianity proposes to reform, of which it requires the reform, and whose reform it commits to its ministers and disciples as their great work. Have they made it their great work? Admitting all that can be fairly asked, for the high aim of Christians, for the changes which they have actually produced, and for the fact that they are doing the work whenever they preach the Gospel faithfully, there is still room for the question, whether they have commonly proposed to themselves the correction of evils, and the reform of society, as a distinct and commanding object. Nay, more than this; — has there not been, and is there not now, in a large proportion of Christian minds, so far as we can judge, a settled and very easy conviction, that the race and the world are not to be materially changed, in regard to practical and prevalent evils?

In seeking an answer to this question for myself, taking it in its many forms and relations, I have endeavored to separate the true from the false, and be just to each. I know my own tendency, like that of all, to some favorite and exaggerated view. And I come to my brethren, not to inform, but to confer with them, as to this momentous question, which the past and the present are forcing upon our attention, — involving the duty, the practicability, and the best mode of carrying forward that work, for which Christ came and commissioned apostles and preachers — to redeem and regenerate man. In those significant words, “redeem” and “regenerate,” which, all admit, express better than any other words the aim and end of Christianity, I can find no meaning, that does not require me to labor, directly and in faith, for the removal of *all* actual evils. In this conviction, there is nothing visionary. It has no alliance with new organizations, better institutions, social

perfectibility, or man's omnipotence. We need go into no rhapsodies about the intuitions of the soul, or that abused truth, the dignity of human nature. As the child of God, formed in his image, and called to share his perfection, the dignity of man cannot be easily over-stated; and they will never live worthily of themselves or their Maker, who disparage or forget it. But the danger and the depravity of man are to be remembered, as well as the dignity. And it may be, that the whole truth, in this respect, is as well expressed in three lines of the poet Young, as in any entire system, others' or our own.

"Revere thyself — and yet thyself despise.
His nature no man can o'errate,
And none can underrate his merit."

Now it is the admission of both these truths, which may best serve to indicate the duty of the Christian minister. All Christians have admitted the one or the other; few, both. The vast majority of Christians have always asserted the depravity of man. But where have they placed that depravity? In his nature, more than in his character; in original more than in actual transgression. Depravity has been theological, far more than practical; general, not specific; universal and total, but not individual, acquired, free, and thus responsible and remediable. Hence the aim has been to correct opinions, rather than conduct; to reform errors, more than practical evils. The powers and anathemas of the Church have been reserved for heresy. Penalty, persecution, excommunication, extermination, have all been visited upon heresy. And in the past and the present, the heretic is in greater danger in most Christian churches, than the knave, the liar, the slanderer, the sensualist, even the open adulterer. True, there is a reason for this, and a professed principle, which we are not to overlook. They who thus think and act, believe that the source of all sin is in the heart, as we know it is. They also believe, that the source of all error is in the heart, and that the error is often the cause of the sin, therefore the greater evil and to be first eradicated. This is the theory. And it is virtually the reasoning of our own brethren, as well as others; at least in regard to the principle of reform. They aver, that admitting, as all do, that Christianity de-

mands reform, it proposes to accomplish it only by the power of truth. It deals with principles. It lays its axe at the root of the tree, and cares not to amuse or expend itself in lopping the branches. Enlighten the mind, purify the heart, and you need not concern yourself with this evil or that crime. Let the soul be regenerated, and then, not before and no otherwise, will sin and evil cease.

Granted. But how is the soul to be regenerated? It is clear enough, that if you make a man Christian, he will be no longer heathen, or vile. Convert the world to Christianity, and reform and reformers will be needless. This has always been known, and always been acted upon. But the world has not been converted. Christianity has been preached at home, and carried abroad. Its ministers and messengers have gone out over the whole earth, and yet little more than a fourth part of its inhabitants are even nominally Christians. And what is still more sad, the small proportion of the really Christian, abroad or at home, seems to cause less anxiety, and to call out less effort, than the extension of the name and the doctrine. The actual sins and known vices remain, and do not seem to be the objects of special regard or reform. The anxiety is still to bring in new converts to the nominal Church, rather than to make the Church itself morally pure, or the community wholly Christian.

It is said by many, that the Church is the divinely constituted agent of reform, the sufficient, and the only proper agent. If it be so, have we not a right to expect some proof of it, to look for results where the trial is fairly made? Are there any results which go to prove, that those churches that rely wholly on their own organization for moral influence, refusing all other associations or aids, refusing indeed to speak or act directly for special reforms, have secured, either for themselves or others, any peculiar share of moral excellence, or even exemption from gross offences? We think not. If indeed it be contended, that the best influences of religion are all unseen, and that outward immorality is no proof of inward corruption, there is little to be said. But if vices are sins, and reform, beginning in the heart, must declare itself in the life, beginning in the Church, must act upon society and the world, it will be difficult to show, that purely ecclesiastical action has

done most, or that preaching against sin in general has been as effectual as preaching against particular sins. The greatest moral reforms that have been witnessed in the Church or society, have been effected by definite action on the definite evil. And it is at least questionable, whether the evils which still afflict humanity, retard Christianity, and make the very name of 'Christian professor' to be a scoff to multitudes in our own and Heathen lands, can ever be abolished, or greatly diminished, without the decided expression and united effort of all Christians for the desired and definite change. Let there be that expression and effort, to any high degree, the change will be seen.

Is this romantic? Take a single illustration, pressed upon us by passing events. The most signal departure from the spirit and letter of the Gospel, confessedly one of the greatest and saddest obstacles to its progress, has been War. From the hour that a midday vision, so unlike that of the Apostle, presented to the imagination or ambition of a Roman Emperor the cross of Christ as an ensign of battle and pledge of earthly conquest, is to be dated that union of the Church with the State, which has brought so sad a verification of the words of our Saviour: — "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." They have fought. Expressly as his servants, in his name, for his truth and glory, they have fought. They have declared it to be right and Christian to fight. Not content with insisting that war is inherent in the fallen nature of man, they have proclaimed it consistent with the new religion of Christ. Nay, they go behind Christ to an earlier lawgiver, and say, as they have often said in so many words and constantly in act, that it is a libel on the God of Moses and Joshua to pronounce war barbarous or unchristian. So far from being regarded as unchristian, it has received its chief countenance and support from the Christian Church, and continues at this hour to have the sanction and employ the energies of the first Christian nations. It is in fact, as before intimated, the first and only element, in which all Christians have cordially united. From the times in which that holy man, of whom Luther said — "If there ever has been a pious monk who feared God, it was St. Bernard" — took for his motto, and the incentive of his followers in battle, the bold declaration, —

"To be slain, is to benefit yourself; to slay, is to benefit Christ," — Christians of all names have merged all differences in the covenant of human blood. Refusing to kneel together at any altar of the Prince of Peace, they have welcomed all to the temple of Mars. Excommunicating each other to-day from the Church on earth, and so far as they may, from the Church in heaven, they will pray and commune together to-morrow, before they march in fraternal bands to the destruction of those whom their Lord commanded them to bless!

This is simple fact, to be used as illustration. Connect with it another fact; that Christians, through this whole period and practice, have been preaching the Gospel, have diffused it among all people at an expenditure and sacrifice only less than those of war, have made its acceptance and observance essential, and declared it to be the power that can and will regenerate the earth, changing even the wolf to the lamb, and the sword to the ploughshare. Let us suppose that this same preaching and evangelizing had been accompanied by a different commentary. Without imagining any extraordinary virtue, we may suppose that Christians were always opposed to war; that, as did most in the first ages, they had continued to this time to say mildly, but immovably, 'We cannot fight.' Would this have been useless? Would the Christian or the Heathen world have presented the same aspect that they now wear, in regard to any common evils or great interests? Every one believes the contrary. We know, that according to the very principles of human nature, and through the mighty power of God in Christ, such a protest, calmly and consistently sustained, would have wrought a reform, whose power and blessing every cause and every man would have shared. And so will it be, if Christians will thus speak and act *now*. Let the Church, or any large branch of it, let one Christian nation, take this position, it will be felt throughout the world. Let ministers, with or without combination, speak and act as consistent Christians in all things, it will be seen whether their power or their present deficiency has been much overrated. If a church believes that it is itself the only proper or needed peace-society, well; only let it show itself to be a peace-society. If a bishop, a pastor, or a brother, feels that he cannot join

any association, and cannot willingly preach or willingly hear on the Sabbath of such worldly and vexed matters as war, intemperance, slavery, and licentiousness, well; only let him, in his own way, with perfect freedom, undisturbed and unsuspected, speak audibly and intelligibly, for peace, temperance, liberty, and purity. 'Show yourself,' respectfully would I say to every one, as I would have every one freely say to me, 'show yourself to be true to your own principles, and to your Master's commission. Let your light shine. Let it be seen where and what you are. This, the Church and the world, especially at this day, have a right to ask. Let it be known that you live. Let it be believed that you are a Christian. Let no man ask — is he for or against Christian reform. Let no large, nor the littlest soul have reason to doubt, whether you care for other souls. Suffer not the sensualist, the defrauder, the corrupter, the revengeful and warlike, to extol your liberality, and quote you as no opposer. Speak the truth; speak it in love, but the truth, and the whole truth, personal, practical, spiritual. Speak as the servant of God, against all that God has forbidden, for all that he commands or asks. Speak as the minister of Christ, gently but fearlessly, and with authority, in behalf of that which Christ's pure and peaceful religion, his regenerating and saving faith, would accomplish.'

Greatly shall I be misapprehended and wronged, if in using this language, or any other, I am supposed to be actuated by that spirit of censoriousness, which has become so common that one can hardly speak freely without exciting the suspicion. We may none of us escape the imputation, may we all be kept from the weakness and wickedness of the temper, which is most intolerant when it calls most fiercely for charity and liberty, and in its mode of exercising love betrays a disposition akin to that which engenders hate and war. Our accountableness for that which we say and do, or refuse to say and do, is not to any man, however independent, nor to any number, however associated. There is an accountableness to God, which is quite enough for any one to bear. Of this I would say something, as an important point, and the principal one that I further touch. I view it in its single relation to reform, and the duty of the minister as a reformer.

It will be seen that I use the word, reform, not technically but broadly, as standing for all moral and religious improvement. It is therefore a large and solemn matter, to attempt to measure the accountableness of ministers of the Gospel, in this relation. It pertains to their very mission. It covers their whole work. And one is left to wonder beyond measure, how any human being can presume to judge of the degree of this accountableness for another. Yet this is done, whenever it is assumed that we *ought* to devote ourselves to this or that work, apart from our stated ministrations, and are guilty and responsible if we do not. It is necessary to say this, in order to put in its true light, and a strong light, our actual relation to those movements, which are commonly understood by the term 'reforms;' a term in which much is to be included, pertaining to ignorance, pauperism and crime, as well as more glaring evils. I hold this relation to be a very important one, but I hold that nothing connected with it is more important, than our duty as well as liberty to judge of it for ourselves, individually, and irresponsibly as regards all but God. This is true of our whole duty, as ministers and men. But it is particularly true of our duty there, where it has been particularly or impliedly denied. There has been, beyond dispute, a new and singular disposition evinced of late, to dictate to ministers their course and their duty, in reference to certain causes and associations. About this and against it, enough perhaps has been said in various ways. I am not inclined to magnify its importance, and am by no means willing that it should divert us, as it certainly does not exempt us, from the obligation to look at these alleged duties earnestly, as well as independently. Yet I am not willing to enter upon the question of duty at all, without a sober protest against all dictation and imputation whatever. There are duties which a Christian community, and those portions of it particularly with which we are professionally connected, have a right to expect of us as pastors and preachers. But the duties to which I now refer are not of this class. No community, no society, not our own churches, have any right to tell us what we shall do or not do, say or not say, in reference to the social and political questions which agitate the public mind. Our acting and our mode of acting, our speech and our silence,

are to be as perfectly free, as those of other men ; which is all we ask. There is a sense in which all men are bound to exert an influence in favor of truth and right. But that self-constituted authority, which undertakes to determine for others what truth and right are, and holds ministers in special accountable to itself for their decision and action, often branding them with epithets and imputations offensive alike to human and divine law, is a usurpation as bold, and a tyranny as intolerable, as any that Church or nation or autocrat ever exercised.

But this after all, and at the worst, is a small matter compared with duty. We demean ourselves when we allow folly to be an excuse for apathy. He who does nothing for temperance, because some of its advocates have been intemperate and injurious, or says nothing about slavery, except that many of its opposers are wild and intolerant, manifests in another form the narrowness and error which he condemns. Though you could prove that all abolitionists are madmen, and all non-resistants fools, and total abstinence suicide and murder, it would not be the only truth, nor the greatest truth, in regard to slavery, war, and drunkenness. I suppose our whole duty and responsibility in this province may be expressed by some such affirmation as we made in the beginning, applicable to ministers in common with all ; namely, for the removal of all moral evils, we are required to use Christian means, and forbidden to use any other ; being personally accountable, to some degree, for the prevalence of those evils, to which we have failed to apply Christian truth and influence, and not accountable at all, where we have applied them faithfully, however ineffectually.

That Christianity not only proposes the removal of moral evils, but that it is able to effect it, and will effect it some time or other, is a common belief. If it be our belief, or if we believe in any social and spiritual progress, it is a primary question — how is that progress ever to be made ? Are we ever to possess any other means or other powers of accomplishing the great ends of Christianity, than those now possessed ? If not, there is a palpable absurdity in the way in which Christians talk of future advancement and final completeness, while they deny the possibility of removing present obstacles by any use of the highest, even

Christian influences. What do we mean, when we pray that the world may be converted to truth and holiness, in 'God's own time?' Do we suppose that He will act differently, or that men will act differently? Is not this God's own time, and will he give any other kind of time, or other kind of men and means? Is the mere passage of time, or the peopling and crowding of the earth, to renovate it? As well expect that the passage of the body through corruption, will work the spirit's incorruption. Our very assertion, that there is to be no further revelation, no higher or better Christ, and our indignant reproof of the opposite assertion, throw upon us a tremendous responsibility, and demand of us, at the least, that we put to full proof our present means, and give our religion free course. Does any man doubt, that this religion can remove the mighty obstacles that now impede it? Does any man believe, that it ever will remove them, except through human agency and fidelity, such as *we* can use as well as any future generation? There cannot be a question, that if Christian ministers alone, all of them, would put full faith, not merely in the future and possible, but in the present and actual power of their religion, would show first that this religion is having its legitimate effect on their own characters, and then apply it, meekly and charitably, but strictly and thoroughly, to all the vices, sins and evils of society, the effect would be as distinct as it would be sure. Now it is not distinct. The Gospel is preached, but the vices remain. Sin in the aggregate is sufficiently exposed, but it laughs and riots on. There is no change bearing any proportion to that which the Gospel promised, and which we imply as possible in every prayer we utter. The grossest iniquities live in the bosom of the Church, and stalk abroad in the most Christian communities. We preach on year after year, ten, twenty, forty years, and remain morally just where we were at the beginning, if indeed we have not lost. Tell me, brethren, why it is so. I may be utterly ignorant of the cause, and may talk foolishly about the cure, — but I do know the fact, and I feel it in my inmost soul. I feel that there is somewhere a frightful accountableness. We are immeasurably distant from the Christian standard. Not prating at all about degeneracy, nor raising the faintest idea of perfection, we say there

are positive violations of the Christian law, open outrages upon justice and humanity, enormities as opposed to Christ's precepts and temper as night to noon, yet so incorporated with the very life of society, so interwoven with the customs, laws, and institutions of the land, that you are forbidden to touch them, lest you bring down the whole fabric in ruins. Yet more, it is gravely said, you need not touch them. The Gospel does not require it. You may declare the whole counsel of God, but need not disturb the complacency of one of these sins or sinners. And so the ministry goes on, the ministry of reconciliation, the mighty array of apostles, evangelists, pastors and teachers, employed in the sublime and safe work of splitting words, defending doctrines, wrangling for forms, creating or opposing organizations, denouncing and devouring one another, and leaving unmoved, declaring immoveable, those moral evils, which make all else seem a pretence and a mockery.

But what would you have, it is asked. Do you demand that we say more of these evils specifically, preach about them often and by name, join those who combine against them, and mourn aloud over the awfulness and accountableness? No, I do not demand this. But I earnestly ask, that all who choose to do this, as well as all who choose not to do it, may be left free even from suspicion of unworthy motives. The mode of action, or the measure of accountableness, I decide for no one, and no one may decide for me. That of which I feel the want in myself, and believe to be the general and radical want, is first a more earnest conviction, not only of the existence, but of the magnitude and turpitude of these moral evils, and then a religious, resolute purpose of directing to them the whole power of Christian truth and requisition, each in his own way, but a way unequivocal and manly. The constant and evasive question, whether these things really belong to the Gospel, or to the work of the minister, should be settled and silenced by the plain consideration, were there no other, that they stand directly in the way of the Gospel, and mock its purpose and its preacher. If a man feel this, he will not ask, and need not be told, what he is to do. There have been men among us, who were never declaimers nor denouncers, partisans nor fanatics, but whose opinions on

every question of right and humanity were clear as the day, and so felt that every one has said — ‘Were there many like these, Christianity would speedily triumph.’ And one characteristic of these men has been their love of their calling, a fidelity to their sacred work, which of itself gave them power for every other. Instead of turning any away from the Gospel and the ministry, the evils and duty of which we speak should hold them the faster to this ministry, and make them cling to the Gospel as the only hope of salvation.

When the good Leighton was once reproved for not preaching up the times, he replied — “If all of you preach up the times, you may surely allow one poor brother to preach up Christ Jesus and eternity.” Yet why need these be separated, as if opposed? We are to preach Christ Jesus, by preaching as he preached, — for the times, in all their defects, iniquities, and demands, — for the times present and to come, in view of a perfect religion, and eternal issues. This is a part of our accountableness, and at this moment a very serious part. We are accountable for our use of this divine energy and this high calling at all times, but most when their influence is most needed. We are accountable, if we give any just cause for the assaults made on the ministry. We are accountable, if we either keep to this ministry so formally and narrowly that we are never felt beyond it, scarcely within it, or leave it so often and far as to make it forgotten or lamented that we have any connection with it. And may I add, that we are accountable, if we suffer our liberal theology and singular charity to render us now indifferent, and now intolerant, of opinion; while all the time we forget or boldly deny those sources of sin and powers of selfishness in the human heart, which have caused all the darkness and desolation of earth. We hold not the first principle of Christian reform, until we feel the absolute necessity of this reform, and discern the seat of the evil, the place for the radical change. Say it who will, and as they may, — is it not true, that as a class of believers, preachers, and actors, we make too little of human depravity? That we believe it is not original or total, but voluntary and individual, is the very reason why we should deal with it closely and anxiously. If it have no root and no apology in our nature, it is verily a

gigantic and frightful iniquity. Why is it, that the evils of which we have spoken are so universal, and, as many say, incurable? Why has it been necessary from the beginning, for God, and Christ, and man, to employ such vast ministrations and mighty agencies, merely to restrain men from evil—and so greatly in vain? Let any one go back six thousand years, and stand with the first man in his fair heritage, or come down four thousand years, and stand on the mount of Beatitudes, knowing all that the world had already learned, and hearing all that Christ then promised,—would he be able to believe, that at this distance of time not only passions but opinions would predominate, through the best portions of Christendom, in favor of vast *systems* of iniquity, such as slavery and war, while the lusts that create these, create all other forms of social and political corruption, to a degree that causes wise and calm men to mourn and despair? That Christians can despair, is melancholy enough. That such partial views are taken of Christianity and destiny; that men remain for centuries unconscious or indifferent to monstrous evils, and when they awake to the reality of one, pursue it to the forgetfulness of all others; that in this advanced age, a man may be imprisoned and slain for speaking his own thoughts, or attempting to do to others as he would they should do to him; that scarcely one of Christ's moral laws can be strictly applied to individuals and society, without the charge of interference or extravagance;—all this, and much more of equally common fact, indicate a nature or tendency for which 'frailty' seems a very inadequate term, and 'depravity' none too strong.

Brethren, if there be any truth or justice in what I have offered, let me ask, if right views and impulses are not to come chiefly from Christian ministers? The subject is linked in with our profession in every way, and commends itself especially to our denomination. I love the profession, I love the denomination. Let me not exaggerate or forget the accountableness of either. Our views of theology and humanity, our hope for society and the soul, connect us (and commit us, if any views can,) with the distinct work of Christian reform. Our duty, of course, has conditions and limitations. Of some of these I purposed to speak. But beside the want of time, it is too plain to be more than

stated, that accountableness pertains to means and efforts, not to results; that the same law which binds us to use all Christian means, forbids us to use unchristian means, or to spend ourselves in regrets and reproaches, when we have done right in a right temper. It is a mistake which the reformer has always made, that he is to change everything, and finish the world's work. Yet this is a harmless vanity, compared with the egregious and dangerous absurdity, that reformers are not accountable for consequences; that to be a martyr, is a glory worth every cost; that if any will fight against God, we may fight against *them*, and pursue them at least with all opprobrious epithets and injurious treatment. It is well to consider, that the wicked as well as the good are in the hands of God, and that the good are accountable for the means they use even in reforming the wicked. The faith that is to remove mountains, must be calm and patient, strong in hope, and greatest in charity. Are there any of whom such faith is to be expected, if not of the disciples of Christ, and ministers of his Gospel? They are not insignificant. They are never powerless, except when they stretch or trifle with their power. In numbers alone, taking all names and climes, they are a great army. And could they move in one phalanx, clad all in the armor of God, who doubts that that which Jesus said of the first whom he sent out, would be again and more widely witnessed, "I beheld Satan fall, as lightning, from heaven."

Our hope is in Christ and the Church. Let us show our love for both, by our reliance on them alone. Let us show that we are Christian ministers, by single and hearty devotion to the Christian ministry. Let us stand up and move on, each in his own place and way, a meek yet mighty reformer, by treasuring and being faithful to the great truth, that Christianity proposes the removal of all evils, but regards as the first of reforms, and the highest good in the universe, a spirit born anew and born of God. And this reform it would accomplish by the instrumentality of the Church. As a brother has well said, in a discourse on "Spiritual Renewal," — "The Church is the greatest institution on earth, and if it be faithful to its province, it is the benigntest and most mighty for good things to mankind." Earnestly then must we ask — is the Church

faithful? This has been often asked foolishly, and answered falsely. But let all that pass, and then let the question come back, and abide with us, — is the Church faithful? Are we, its ministers, faithful even to its great idea of the soul's and the world's renewal? If we were, would that renewal be a dream, or be left as only the possible work of future ages? One thing is sure. No future age will have a heavier accountableness to bear, than this; and no denomination, than ours. This I believe, with a seriousness that makes me tremble. With our intelligence, with our Protestant independence, with our proclamation, if not possession, of perfect freedom and perfect charity, with a real individualism that offers the best of all association and cöoperation, with the thrilling ties that bind us to the holy dead, and to the good of every name on earth and in heaven, — if we leave no mark on our country and age, or fail to raise the tone of morals and aim of Christians, in the Church, the state, and society, it may be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for us.

ART. II. — THE CAUSE OF PEACE.*

WE have wished for some time to take notice of the progress which Peace principles are unquestionably making in this and in foreign lands. It is pleasant, when martial

* 1. *Memoir of Thomas Thrush Esq., formerly an Officer of rank in the Royal Navy, who resigned his commission on the ground of the Unreasonableness of War.* By REV. C. WELLBELOVED. London: Longman, Brown & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 116.

2. *Plea for Peace. A Discourse delivered on Fast Day, April 2, 1846.* By DANIEL SHARP, Pastor of the Charles Street Church. Boston: Wm. D. Ticknor & Co. 8vo. pp. 24.

3. *A Sermon on War, preached at the Melodeon, on Sunday, June 7, 1846.* By THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Church in Boston. Boston: Little & Brown. 1846. 8vo. pp. 43.

4. *An Oration delivered before the Authorities of the City of Boston, in the Tremont Temple, July 4, 1846.* By FLETCHER WEBSTER. Boston: J. H. Eastburn. 1846. 8vo. pp. 33.

5. *The Advocate of Peace and Universal Brotherhood.* ELIHU BURRITT, Editor and Proprietor. Worcester, Mass. Nos. 1 — 6; January — June, 1846. 8vo. pp. 24, each No.

sounds are heard in our streets and descriptions of battles fill the columns of our newspapers, to turn to the proofs which the time still furnishes of the spread of just opinions and pacific sentiments in the community. We believe that a very great advance has been made towards a proper estimation of war by Christian nations within the last few years, and circumstances which might at first seem to contradict such a belief, afford, we think, evidence on which it may rest.

Among the indications of a change in the public mind on this subject, the first place is due to the frequent contributions which the press is making to what may be called the pacific literature of the times. Not only have discourses and addresses, advocating very different views from those which were almost universally accepted in the last generation, become common, but — what is a more significant fact — the secular as well as the religious journals of the day freely insert articles, the design of which is to expose the impolicy and unchristian character of war. Few of our readers probably are aware of the amount of sound instruction which is communicated in this way. Besides this means of influence, the distribution of tracts and the circulation of books prepared by the friends of peace, are forming a public opinion which is already felt in its action on both men and measures.

Dr. Sharp's Discourse and Mr. Webster's Oration, in different ways, illustrate this growth of public sentiment. The former is the clear and calm plea of a Christian "advocate for peace," and as such was strictly appropriate to the place from which it was delivered — a Christian pulpit. Yet the pulpit has not always been occupied by those who spoke in this strain; and it is certainly among the favorable signs of the time, that so many preachers of the Gospel have of late given expression to that abhorrence of war, which it might have been thought a study of the life and teaching of Jesus must inspire in every breast. Its uselessness, its wastefulness, its inhumanity, and its immoral influences are described by Dr. Sharp, who closes his Discourse with a direct application to the circumstances in which our country was placed in relation to Great Britain at the time when it was written. Mr. Webster's Oration is, in large part, a defence of military insti-

tutions, evidently called forth by what he must consider the spread of dangerous opinions. It is therefore a sign of the very tendency which he is anxious to arrest, for men do not take the trouble to defend usages the propriety of which is not doubted. The Oration is respectable as a literary performance, and is free from that vicious declamation which once distinguished Fourth of July Addresses. As an argument in justification of war, (or extenuation, he might perhaps prefer we should say,) it is a rather remarkable production. If we could think Mr. Webster capable of such a mischievous prank as attempting to *quiz* "the Authorities of the city of Boston," we should easily understand the meaning of such a passage as this:—"Suppose it impossible for wars to occur, where were nationality, where patriotism, where love of home and friends?" How must the Mayor and Aldermen of Boston have shuddered at the possibility of such peaceful times that there would be no home nor friends for them to love? Unless they saw through the orator's humor, "the authorities" must have had little stomach for their dinner that day. Then too the quiet satire of the question:—"Where would be statesmanship, where had been all the illustrious legislators of former times, and of the present day, had the world been wrapped in immutable peace?" Sad thought for those who look into the future, that an age of the world may come, when peace, mother of barbarism, shall have established a universal reign! Mr. Webster, with some slight inconsistency, "believes and hopes" that wars will one day cease, when "men obey the injunctions of Christ," and most of his Oration was evidently written in a serious and honest spirit, though we entirely dissent from the conclusion he wishes to establish.

Mr. Parker's Sermon may also be taken as a proof of that advance in public sentiment, of which we have spoken. Such an emphatic condemnation of all war would have been regarded a very few years ago with surprise, if not with suspicion of the preacher's sanity. Now no one is surprised, and many agree with the preacher. As a bold and forcible statement of the evils of war, it is entitled to perusal and commendation. Mr. Parker shows by strong language and yet stronger facts, that war causes an immense waste of property, a terrible waste of life, and a fearful

corruption of morals. By a rhetorical supposition he brings the strife of arms into our own neighborhood, and then turns the feelings which his graphic power has awakened against the war which the United States are at this moment waging with Mexico. We cannot however admire the style in which the Sermon is written. As a discourse for the pulpit, it lacks the dignity which ought not to be sacrificed to coarser qualities of style, and discovers that continual aim at effect, which good taste must pronounce a fault. Mr. Parker's later productions are seriously marred by this tendency, which, if not checked, will soon destroy his claim to be considered one of our good writers. He betrays too on almost every occasion, as in this sermon, a petulant anxiety to disparage the Old Testament, which is discreditable to him as a scholar and a believer, neither of which characters, we presume, he wishes to be considered as having forfeited.

The Memoir of the late Mr. Thrush, prepared by his friend, the venerable Mr. Wellbeloved, is a valuable addition to our libraries, — more brief than we should have been glad to receive under this title, but long enough to make the reader acquainted with the chief incidents in the life, as well as the prominent traits in the character, of a most excellent man. Mr. Thrush was one of those few, who act out their convictions at whatever cost of worldly ease, — the true martyrs of principle. They are nobler men than the warriors or rulers whose names shine through the ages, and their lives are better worth studying. They shame, and they encourage us; for they remind us of our own cowardly virtue, and they show us what calm energy our nature can exhibit amidst circumstances of trial confronted for conscience' sake. Mr. Thrush was remarkable for firmness of character. He acted deliberately, but resolutely, forming his opinions with care, and then maintaining them with a *practical* steadfastness worthy of all admiration. These traits were early exhibited. His mother, a sensible and estimable woman, was left a widow, with the care of seven children, when Thomas, the second son, was only nine years old. His inclinations when a youth led him to desire a seafaring life, but the wishes of his mother controlled him, and he prepared himself for the mercantile profession. His love of the sea, however, was too strong

to be supplanted by a fondness for other pursuits, and after giving a fair trial to the employment which he had adopted, he addressed a letter to his mother in which, with the utmost filial respect, he entreated her to consent to a change in his mode of life. It was a letter which no mother could resist; and at the age of twenty-one he made his first voyage, in a small coasting vessel. After other trading voyages, interrupted by considerable intervals of home life, during which he faithfully pursued those studies which would qualify him to enter the naval service, he obtained the appointment of master's mate on board a sloop of war destined for the East Indies. He was now in the employment which he had long coveted, and the attention which he gave to its duties, with the honorable deportment which he maintained, recommended him for promotion. He gradually rose till he reached the rank of Post Captain, and was entrusted with various services in which he displayed good judgment and humane feeling. Mr. Well-beloved observes of this part of his life: —

“It is remarkable, that though the term of Mr. Thrush's service in the navy extended over a period of more than twenty years, during the greater part of which the nation was in a state of war, he was never engaged in any distinguished action with the enemy, nor did he ever obtain more than a trifling share of prize-money. This was a cause of regret to many of his friends, if not to himself; but it proved a source of consolation to him afterwards, when he calmly reviewed his life in the light of Christian truth, that he had not participated in the guilt of shedding human blood, or been enriched by the spoils of war.” — pp. 30, 31.

Mr. Thrush was married, in 1804, to one who shared with him the various experience of nearly forty years. The almost romantic attachment which marked their union, is but partially revealed in the letters from which extracts are given in this volume. Not long after his marriage he purchased a house near the residence of his wife's family in Yorkshire, and retired from active service, partly that he might recover from the effects of severe illness incurred on the West India station. In “the quiet retreat of Sutton” he found an opportunity, on which he gladly seized, of examining carefully and candidly the Scriptural evidence for the doctrines of the Established Church; in

which he had been educated, but doubts concerning which had been awakened in his mind many years before by the circumstance of Rev. Mr. Lindsey's resignation of his living. The result was a full conviction, that the doctrine of the Trinity had no support in Scripture. He continued to worship in the parish church, till the discrepancy between its offices and the teachings of Christ became so painful to him, that, finding no other place of worship at which he could attend with satisfaction, "he felt himself compelled to withdraw from communion with every professed Christian society, and to confine his devotions to his own family and to his closet." This step exposed him to unjust remark, and caused him to appear before the public as a writer, in a "Letter" which he addressed to the inhabitants of the parish in which he resided. The views which he presented in this Letter, he afterwards enlarged and enforced in other pamphlets. But the most important consequence of that earnest study of the Bible to which he now devoted himself was a conviction, that war was in direct opposition to the spirit and purpose of Christianity. From this conclusion he was soon led, by that singleness of mind which distinguished him, to perceive that the profession of arms was one which he was bound, as a Christian, to relinquish. To take such a step would, however, not only mark an entire change in the opinions which he had long honestly held, but would separate him from friends, subject him to ridicule, deprive him of a considerable part of his means of support, and — what he regarded with far more anxiety — compel his wife to endure many privations, and, to use his own language, "doom her to whom he was indebted for so much happiness, to suffer from the effects of what many would no doubt call his extreme folly." He therefore revolved the subject long, before he decided on the course which he should adopt; and then communicated his purpose to Mrs. Thrush, (who, though not altogether unacquainted with his sentiments respecting war, neither participated in them, nor had any knowledge of his secret resolutions,) in a letter written on his sixtieth birthday, and on the eighteenth anniversary of his marriage. This letter, which begins with the warmest expressions of gratitude to the good Providence that had blessed them, and closes with the language of a beautiful religious trust and hope,

contains a full exhibition of his views on the subject which then, and ever afterwards, most interested his mind, and on the course which duty seemed to require him to take. We should be glad to copy the whole, for such letters are not often seen, nor often written, but we have room for only one extract, which none of our readers, we believe, will think too long.

“From the solemnity with which I introduce this letter, you will be led to expect that I have something to communicate of a serious and important nature: it is indeed highly so, both as it regards our present state of existence, and that which will never have an end. That I may occasion you no longer suspense or painful apprehension, I shall without further preface inform you, that after thinking intensely on the subject for the greater part of the year that is just concluded, I have come to the resolution, (should I see no just cause to change my sentiments, and should it please the almighty Disposer of events to continue me so long in this world,) this very day three years hence, to resign my commission in the naval service of my country — that commission which has cost me so many years of painful watching, labor, and exertion, to acquire, and on which for so many years of my life I have placed so high a value, and, what must ever weigh with me, which you, my dearest love, have not held in a lower degree of estimation.

“Having now, as I hope, removed from your mind the apprehensions that the former part of my letter was calculated to excite, by informing you that the evil, if such you contemplate it, is not to take place till a period to which it is even presumptuous to look forward, I proceed to state to you my reasons for a step so extraordinary, and as I believe so perfectly novel; for as far as my information goes, no human being has ever taken the step which I am meditating to take. It behoves me therefore well to weigh the consequences both to myself, to you my better self, and to society at large: for I should deem myself wanting in duty to all, were I, on any principle however plausible, to act with precipitation in a matter involving so many grave and weighty points for my serious consideration. If I find any principle of pride or vain glory lurking in my mind, any desire of worldly fame, or even an undue desire to give weight to my peculiar religious opinions; if after diligently studying the scriptures of truth, and minutely examining into the most secret recesses of my heart, I find that I cannot with godly sincerity make this peace-offering on the altar of God, — be assured that it shall not be made at all. If I cannot resign my professional emoluments and honors, if I must so call them, in a frame of mind and on principles to afford me satisfaction at the awful

moment of my dissolution, be assured that I shall retain them to the last. It is to that period, my dearest love, that we ought constantly to look, not with fear or despondency, but with hope and cheerfulness; towards it we are on our way with a rapid pace, though the time before us not being seen, may appear long to us. Among events that are future to us in this stage of our existence, this is the only one we can reckon upon with certainty, and wisdom tells us, if we will but listen to her admonitions, that as it is our first duty, so it is our highest interest, to keep our lamp constantly trimmed, and to be constantly prepared to meet our future judge. By daily meditating on death we may, I think, not only disarm it of its terrors, but bring ourselves to regard it, as in truth it is, the finishing act of God's mercy to bring us to our destined haven; and this without at all destroying that cheerfulness of mind which may be considered as the best expression of our gratitude to the Giver of all good.

"From many expressions that have of late escaped me both in conversation and in writing, the surprise of the beloved wife of my bosom at the information I have just communicated will be greatly diminished, and you will have anticipated already almost all the reasons I can assign for a step so novel and unprecedented, a step which, should our lives be extended to extreme old age, will deprive us for many years of a large portion of those comforts and conveniences which long habit has brought us to consider as the necessities of life, and, what is I believe of equal consequence to us both, of our ability to be useful and serviceable to others.

"The reasons I have to advance for this extraordinary step are, of course, of a religious nature, and I am sure that you, my love, whose opinion on this occasion is of more consequence to me than that of the whole world, will give me credit for their sincerity. It has of late seemed wonderful to me that any human being, believing in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, can think himself justified in pursuing war *as a trade*. You may, I know, say, that as far as regards me the deed is done, and cannot be undone; that I am now only receiving a reward for my past services, and the labors of the best part of my life; and that had I, with equal diligence and ability followed any other profession, I should probably have been more wealthy than I now am. These considerations may satisfy thousands, many of them, no doubt, pious and good men, and therefore ought to satisfy me. The question is, will such a plea be received at the bar of Christ, as reconcilable to his plain and express commands, and is it not, in fact, following a multitude to do evil? If it be a breach of God's holy law to make *war a trade*, and at the command of one or more of our fellow-creatures to *murder* (for such,

alas! it is,) a number of human beings, not to say fellow-Christians; if this, my beloved wife, is a crime in the eyes of the great Parent of all, surely they cannot be innocent who, after having dedicated the best part of their lives to a trade so little consistent with Christian principles, instead of repenting in dust and ashes for having so misapplied their time, are enjoying the fruits of their criminality, and the wages of their disobedience to one of the first of God's commandments — 'Thou shalt do no murder.'

"Regarding my half-pay in this point of view, you may say it is not my duty to retain it a day or an hour longer. This is, indeed, a subject on which my mind has, at times, been a good deal distracted. It would be unwise in me to persevere in a conduct which I think at variance with my religion; it would be folly in me, without the most mature consideration, to do that which I might afterwards repent of, particularly as I should do it in opposition to the conduct of wise and good men in all ages. After weighing the various arguments both for and against the measure, I have come to the determination (unless you can oppose any just and solid reasons against it, or unless such reasons should suggest themselves to my mind,) in three years from this very day to resign that commission which it cost me so many years to obtain. From the present state of my mind, I do not think that this delay will make any alteration in my sentiments, and the taking this time for deliberation will give more solemnity to the act. If I do resign my commission, I certainly shall think it incumbent upon me to give it every publicity. I shall think it my duty (if I may be so presumptuous as to apply the expression to myself) 'to let my light shine before men.' If, therefore, my life should be so long spared, I propose to employ my pen in advocating the cause of peace, or rather that of injured humanity. Societies have of late been established in different countries, for the benevolent purpose of putting a stop to the horrid and inhuman practice of war: if what I contemplate doing shall forward the views of those who are thus honourably employed, I shall think that I have not lived in vain; nay, that I am forwarding the views of my Lord and Master, and performing an act that will be acceptable to him, by promoting 'peace on earth.' " — pp. 51—55.

The close of the period which Mr. Thrush had chosen for putting his determination to the test, not only found him confirmed in his purpose, but brought to his support the entire sympathy and cooperation of his wife. He accordingly resigned his commission as an officer of the royal navy, in a "Letter addressed to the King," which many of our readers will remember among the publications that

attracted some notice twenty years ago. It was not without reason that he afterwards said, "I believe it required more courage to write that letter than to fight a battle." He took his ground against the force of surrounding opinion, the inveteracy of popular prejudice, the counsel and the sneer of those with whom he had been connected in relations of friendship, and the scornful amazement of all the members of a profession to which he had himself once felt a proud attachment. But he never regretted the step, nor shrunk from its consequences; and although his solitary example produced no perceptible change in the public sentiment on the subject of war, he had the satisfaction of obeying his own sense of right, and he recorded his reverence for the Gospel of peace in facts of imperishable meaning.

From this time Mr. Thrush led a quiet and secluded life, forsaken indeed by many who had once treated him with high regard, but sustained by the consciousness of rectitude, and cheered by the esteem of those friends whom "his upright, fearless, and disinterested conduct" had secured. He occupied himself very much in writing on the subjects which chiefly interested his mind, and at different times published such defences of the views which he had adopted, both on questions of controversial theology and of practical Christianity, as the circumstances in which he was placed seemed to him to require. Some of these tracts he issued from a press of his own construction, which he worked with his own hands, exhibiting in his old age an inventive faculty and a patient industry which may alike claim our admiration. His habits were those of a cheerful, but thoughtful Christian, who knew the value of time, yet was most mindful of eternity. Though a sufferer from chronic rheumatism, complaint was a stranger to his lips, while feelings of gratitude and trust filled his heart. Never idle,* and

* It is too remarkable a proof of Mr. Thrush's diligence to be omitted, as well as an evidence of the high purpose which always animated him, that on the day after he entered his sixtieth year he began the study of Greek. In a journal which he then kept, he remarks:—"By dedicating about half an hour morning and evening to this study, and taking up a book occasionally during the day, I have already made such progress as to give me hope that by persevering as I have begun, I may in about a year be able to read the New Testament in that language. This is indeed the principal end I have in view, in commencing so arduous a study at so advanced a period of life."

always anxious to draw attention to the principles for which he had sacrificed so much, he published, in his eighty-first year, his final plea in behalf of those principles, under the title of "Last Thoughts of a Naval Officer on the Unlawfulness of War." "With this publication," says Mr. Wellbeloved, "the labors of this excellent man in the service of what, after much careful and impartial inquiry, he deemed important truth, terminated." The short remainder of his days, he spent in tranquil expectation of the close. "'Thou will keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee.' Never," says his biographer, "was this declaration of the prophet more beautifully exemplified than in the last year of the life of the venerable subject of this memoir." During the protracted illness of the wife whom he so dearly loved, "he soothed and enlivened her by his unremitting attentions and cheerful conversation." Mrs. Thrush recovered only to take her place beside his sick bed. An injury which he received from a fall hastened his death. We cannot deny ourselves the privilege of quoting Mr. Wellbeloved's words.

"From that time his strength gradually failed, but the energy of his mind was unimpaired, and his patience and resignation became more perfect as his sufferings increased. Though he was evidently at times in great pain, he uttered no complaint; and when he saw the anxiety and distress of his beloved wife, he would say, 'that he was in the state in which it had pleased God to place him, and that after all the mercies he had received, it was his duty to submit without repining.' His religious principles had never been with him mere matters of speculation; he had studiously applied them to the regulation of his temper and his conduct. He had lived by his faith; it had enhanced his joys; it had mitigated his sorrows, and now he felt its inestimable value, in the sentiments of filial confidence towards God which it encouraged, in the trust which it enabled him to repose in a wise and gracious Providence, and in the prospects it opened to him beyond the limits of this transient scene of human being. He was chiefly occupied on devotional subjects, and in hearing passages from the Scriptures read to him; but when a friend called in occasionally, he would enter into conversation, and take an interest in the passing events of the day. He remained in this state till within a few days of the closing scene, when, though seemingly sensible of the presence of those about him, he was not able to speak, yet his lips were observed to move as if employed in prayer. On the morning of the 10th

of July he ceased to breathe, and expired without a struggle or a sigh, having attained the age of eighty-two years.

‘Servant of God, well done! well hast thou fought
The better fight, who ‘nobly’ hast maintained
Against revolted multitudes the cause
Of truth, — — — — —
And for the testimony of truth hast borne
— — reproach; far worse to bear
Than violence: for this was all thy care,
To stand approved in sight of God, tho’ worlds
Judged thee perverse.’ —pp. 107—109.

We have been drawn much farther than we intended from the immediate purpose of this article, yet we know not that we could in any other way have rendered more efficient service to the cause of Peace, than by presenting the example of one who resigned rank, emolument and friendship, that he might bear witness to its claim on the regard of Christian men. This example is worth the more, from the personal excellence and professional standing which forbid the imputation of any sinister purpose, as much as the deliberation which marked his course saves him from the charge of passionate or partial judgment. If it be to his praise, that “he uniformly maintained a religious and virtuous character” amidst the temptations of a life which its admirers admit abounds with moral dangers; a well formed opinion of such a man on a subject on which he was singularly qualified to express a judgment, ought not to be treated as if it were the decision of a weak or visionary mind. Mr. Thrush, however, does not stand alone in the revolution which took place in his opinions. Many in Great Britain and in this country have come to similar conclusions with those which he entertained respecting the unlawfulness of war. And it is among the encouragements of the time, that so many are ready to confess the fact of such a change. The truth is beginning to be understood, and Christendom even now proves itself not insensible to its influence.

We do not mean to attribute more to the direct action of Christianity than facts will warrant, but let any one look at the history of the last ten years and he cannot fail to perceive what a large approach has been made towards a recognition of the great principle, that peace should be the aim of nations. The assertion of this principle by writers and its adoption by statesmen would give a new character

to the politics of the modern world. The step would be easy from this principle to a perception of the uselessness, and then would not men soon come to an acknowledgment of the unlawfulness, of war? Other causes have conspired, and will conspire, with Christianity in enlightening public sentiment. Other agencies may have been more effectual than Peace Societies or Peace Addresses; but it is the injustice of silly prejudice, to deny them any participation in turning the thoughts of men in a right direction. The journal, the title of which we have given at the commencement of our remarks, affords proof that the friends of Peace are not idle. The "Advocate" was originally published by the American Peace Society, of which it is still the organ. At the beginning of the present year it was given into the hands of Mr. Burritt, better known by the truly honorable appellation of "the learned blacksmith." Under his management it has acquired more suitableness to the tastes and wants of the times. This is not, however, the only, nor the principal channel through which Mr. Burritt communicates with the public on a subject to which he now devotes a large part of his time. The "Christian Citizen," a weekly paper published at Worcester, of which he is the editor, makes this a prominent subject of discussion. He has also adopted an ingenious method of engaging the political press as a coadjutor, by printing brief articles, (of perhaps half a column each,) in favor of Peace, and sending these "Olive leaves," as he styles them, to the editors of the various journals throughout the country, by many of whom they are copied, and so gain circulation in a thousand different neighborhoods. As a further means of enlightening the people, he issues a little semi-monthly sheet, containing facts and arguments, which is freely distributed along the great lines of travel.

The American Peace Society has always been crippled in its operations by the want of funds. As it depends for its efficiency on the circulation of tracts, which must be, in great part, gratuitously distributed, and on the services of agents or lecturers, who must be paid, it needs money as the first condition of success. But as the doctrine which it labors to spread, to wit, that war is both unnecessary and wrong, was till of late directly opposed to the belief of almost the whole world, it has been obliged to rely rather

on the zeal than on the number or wealth of its supporters. Very much of what has been accomplished in this work is owing to the disinterested and unwearied energy of two men, very unlike in many personal qualities, but alike ready to give themselves to the promotion of a cause connected most closely, in their judgment, with the best interests of humanity and the consummation of the purpose for which Christ came upon earth. The name of Worcester has become a watch-word with those who are carrying on this great moral enterprise, and to his writings more than to any other single cause may we attribute the position which it now holds among the philanthropic movements of the age. The late Mr. Ladd, besides losing his life through his indefatigable exertions, left the bulk of his property to the Peace Society. Unforeseen embarrassments have till recently prevented the advantage, which he intended, from accruing from this bequest, nor was its amount such as very much to increase the resources of the Society. With all the difficulties against which they have been obliged to contend, we can only rejoice that its Executive Committee have been able to act with so much vigor, and we do sincerely and earnestly commend their labors to the countenance of our readers; who may cooperate with them by enrolling themselves as members of the Society, by purchasing and distributing the various publications which bear its imprint, by attending its meetings, held in various parts of the country, and by speaking on every suitable occasion in behalf of the principles and policy which it advocates. Its object is carefully defined in the Constitution, and should not be confounded with anything else, good or bad. Attempts have been made to create a prejudice against those by whom its operations are conducted, on the ground of an improper desire which they had shown to connect the Society with other questions now before the community; but for any one acquainted with their proceedings, no evidence was needed of the injustice of such an imputation. At the late annual meeting, however, the Society thought proper to guard against any misconception of its character in future, by passing a series of resolutions, pronouncing that "the Society, as it ever has done, will confine itself strictly to the single object of abolishing international war;" that "the Society be so managed as to

be kept entirely distinct from all extraneous subjects, as it has heretofore been"; and that "the basis of the First General Peace Convention in London, 1840, viz. 'the inconsistency of war with Christianity and the true interests of mankind' be regarded as the proper basis of cooperation in the cause of Peace."

The recent danger of a rupture with Great Britain called forth, both there and here, an expression of sentiment which we regard as a most happy omen for the future; nor do we doubt that the strength of this expression had weight in determining the counsels of our rulers. It was a glorious fact for the Christian to contemplate and for the historian to record, that when the governments of the two countries seemed to be drawing nearer every moment to an actual collision, the people on both sides cried out that it must not and should not be; and this, not from fear of defeat if the battle should be joined, nor from an apprehension of the disastrous influence on business, but from higher considerations — from a perception of the incongruity of war with the true principles of civilization and Christianity. The Addresses which have been exchanged between the Old World and the New, deprecating the recurrence of hostilities, and appealing to the sympathies of a common humanity, are among the noblest productions of the age. We read them with more pleasure than the most forcible declarations of our rights to which the Revolutionary struggle gave birth, for they mark a higher point in the progress of mankind. Those breathe the rough notes of liberty, these the sweet tones of love. The era of liberty is but the preparation for the era of love. The Addresses from the citizens of old Boston and old Plymouth to the inhabitants of places bearing the same names on this side the great ocean, from Sunday School scholars in England to those who enjoy similar instruction in America, from ministers of the Gospel of "the Father" to others holding the same divine faith, are pledges as well as proofs, that outweigh in value a thousand State papers or Speeches of eloquent men. They come from the people, who are every day approaching their true position as the rulers of the world. They foretell a time when the lion and the eagle will be accounted unfit emblems of national sovereignty, and Massachusetts will be glad to erase at least one

word from the motto she now bears on her escutcheon — “*Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem.*” We cannot perhaps introduce in a more suitable place one of these Addresses, which it is proper should appear somewhere on our pages. It is

“*From the undersigned Ministers of the Gospel, in Great Britain and Ireland, worshipping ‘One God the Father,’ to the Ministers of the same faith with themselves in the United States of America.*”

“BRETHREN, — We address you with painful feelings, on the critical state of the relations which exist between your country and our own. For more than thirty years we have been at peace; a long period in the life even of the oldest of us; a period during which some of us have come into existence, and others have grown up to manhood, and entered upon that sacred calling, in the duties of which we are engaged. In that period the nations to which we respectively belong, have become mutually better acquainted, and, we trust, more endeared. For ourselves, we feel bound to you by the remembrance of the wise, the holy, the benevolent, who now sleep in Jesus; by our veneration for the memory of Channing and the Wares, of Tuckerman and Worcester, of Abbot, Buckminster and Greenwood; and by our regard for many who are yet living and laboring among you, with some of whom we have had personal intercourse, while to others we are indebted for valuable contributions to theological science and religious literature. And we are earnestly desirous, that between a nation with which we are thus connected, and our own, no other relations should exist than those of mutual helpfulness and love.

“Disputes have arisen between Britain and America about their respective claims to the possession of the Oregon territory. We give no opinion on the subject: we neither determine, nor ask you to determine, whose claim is the stronger; but we are sure that the value of the territory to either party is as nothing compared with the guilt and the sufferings of war.

“A proposal has been made to refer the dispute to arbitration. It has been rejected. We do not here censure the rejection; but we may be allowed to regret, that an opportunity should have been lost of applying the practice of arbitration to national differences; a practice the prevalence of which would soon make war, with all its enormities and horrors, an obsolete barbarism. The rejection increases the probability of war; — war which substitutes for a discussion of moral right, a mere struggle of physical force; which appeals from the perception of truth and the practice of justice, the glorious distinctions of our nature, to

the exercise of violence ; and in which we surrender our prerogative as men, and take our precedent from the brutes, who are impelled solely by appetite, and have not the faculties requisite for a just decision.

"The prevalence of Christianity and the advancement of civilization have prohibited all war except between nation and nation. Individuals must submit their conflicting claims to the award of law : the magistrate represses all attempts to overrule or supersede right by force. In our families we repress all violence, and if our little ones attempt to decide their differences by blows, they are promptly taught, by instruction and rebuke, that it is not thus that questions between brethren should be settled. And are we not all brethren ? 'Have we not all one Father ? Hath not one God created us ?' And does He look with less displeasure on strife and violence than we do ? If we, being evil, are anxious to train up our families in mutual affection, and visit with displeasure every infringement of it ; how much more shall our Father who is in heaven, look down with holy anger on his children, when they forget the tie of brotherhood that binds them, and engage in mutual injury and bloodshed.

"Brethren, we say not these things as if it were needful to convince you ; for we are sure that you sympathize in those feelings of abhorrence with which we regard the apprehended war. But we are desirous to strengthen your convictions and feelings by the expression of our own ; and we invite you to co-operate with us in cherishing those sentiments of mutual regard, which, we trust, will yet secure the continuance of peace between our respective nations, especially as the latest information gives us more cheerful hope of the peaceful spirit of your countrymen generally. As disciples of the Prince of Peace, as preachers of the gospel of peace, we feel that we are acting in consistency with our holy profession, when in our public ministrations, in our pastoral intercourse, and in every possible way, we maintain peace, and strengthen the spirit of good-will among men ; and we shall be happy, if, in this momentous crisis, we can contribute to so desirable an object. We are sure, Brethren, that in responding to our invitation, you will be doing that which you will remember with satisfaction to the latest moment of your existence, and of which you will not be ashamed before the Lord Jesus Christ at his coming. Let our united prayers ascend, that 'the God of Peace may give us peace always, by all means.' "

Many circumstances indicate that a pacific policy must in future govern the relations of civilized nations towards one another. The cabinets of Europe, if they do not avow,

show that this is the policy which they are anxious to maintain. Louis Philippe, the wisest monarch of the age, has openly and repeatedly committed himself to such a policy. Even Austria, bristling with bayonets, and Russia, the last of the European powers to emerge from barbarism, avoid, rather than seek, occasions of war. The change which has taken place in this respect within a single generation, is immense. Difficulties are now arranged by means of diplomatic discussion, that within our own time would have been referred to the decision of arms. The last Report of the American Peace Society observes, we believe, with perfect truth, that "had public sentiment on the subject been what it was fifty years ago" — or even thirty — "no power on earth could have prevented a fierce and protracted war" from arising out of the recent difficulties between our Government and England, "that might in its progress have involved the leading nations of Christendom, and overspread the whole earth with its baleful results."

We are not so simple as to imagine that modern statesmen go to the New Testament for the principles by which to regulate the intercourse between their respective countries. That is to be the glory of another age, when rulers shall sit at the feet of Jesus, and the Gospel shall be studied as the text-book of the politician. But we esteem it no small gain, that public men must regard, and cannot mistake the effect of war on the industrial and commercial interests of nations. War is seen to cost more than it is worth. Glory is a dear purchase when it beggars a people, or throws all their affairs into confusion. The day is not very distant, when Franklin's story of the whistle will be read with as much self-application by the man who is called to vote supplies for an army, as by the boy who has only six copper cents to spend. Neither is it a circumstance of but little moment, that a generation has grown up unused to war, and — what is better still — accustomed to the security and comforts of peace. To be sure, the world has not quite outgrown the folly and blasphemy in which it has long indulged, when speaking of the field of battle and the warrior's claim to admiration; but we think that few have read without a thrill of horror that terrible passage in the account of a victory which the British army gained a few months since in India: — "The river was full

of sinking men. *For two hours volley after volley was poured in upon the human mass* — the stream being literally red with blood. *No compassion was felt or mercy shown.*" It will not need many such confessions of the character of warfare, to call forth a cry of indignation before which even a Wellington might quail. To be sure, there is still a fascination about military success, that neither wise men nor good men seem to have the power to resist. But it is a fascination, not a calm conclusion, by which they are held, and which cannot therefore hold them always under its influence. Ten years hence many a member of Congress will wonder at his own votes in the summer of 1846. To be sure, they who write on the wickedness and impolicy of war take special care to except defensive war, and tell us in poor, bravado style, that "in a war waged against our undoubted rights, we [Americans] feel ourselves more than a match for the world";* but this blemish cannot destroy the force of their juster thoughts, nor prevent sensible readers from perceiving what needless pains they take to intercept the effect of their own arguments. To be sure, young men can be found to play the soldier, and boys to run after them as after any other grotesque exhibition; but in an age, when Catholic prelates bless the locomotives of a railroad instead of the standards of an army,† we do not much fear that the custom of war will prevail over the habits of peace.

* See an excellent paper on "War in its Democratic and Economic Relations" in the last number of the "New Englander;" a journal, of whose general management we would speak in terms of sincere admiration; but that the editor should have used its pages for the publication of such atrocious nonsense as fills one paragraph of another article in the same number, confounds us. A Christian writer, in the shades of New Haven, wishing that "a warlike spirit, rightly based, and rightly kept alive," may be given to our age, and pronouncing "their war spirit" "not the least best" among the noble qualities for which we revere our ancestors!

† At the late opening of the railroad from Paris to Belgium, celebrated with great pomp at Lille, on Sunday, June 14, the Archbishop of Cambrai "proceeded to the benediction of the locomotives. We saw the proud machines," says an eye-witness, "advance slowly, inclining the flags with which they were decorated, and stop at the feet of the archbishop, who pronounced over them the sacramental words." We can conceive of a more appropriate employment for the successor of Fenelon, on the Lord's day. Still we say it was better than pronouncing a benediction on military banners. And as a sign of the tendencies which place our age in such strong contrast with the past, it was not an unprofitable ceremony.

It may be thought that the war in which we are involved with Mexico is a contradiction of what we have said respecting the prevalence of more just opinions, but we consider this only a cloud, which, though black indeed, cannot long overhang the fair prospect on which we have been looking. Of that war we do not hesitate to speak in the plainest terms of reprobation. We contemplate its character from a higher ground than any which political considerations might furnish. We regard it simply in its moral aspects; and we say, that viewed in this light, it is a war which can only involve this country in disgrace and guilt. It has already plunged it deep in guilt and disgrace. Let Mexico have been ever so neglectful of justice to us, it was base and mean in us to send our forces into her territory, whether to conquer or to frighten her. The war was sought by us, is at the moment when we write this needlessly and wickedly prosecuted by us, and, end as it may, must leave a blot on our name. And we believe that this is the opinion of three-fourths of the sensible part of the people. The calm good sense of the country, from one end to another, is against the war. It may save or it may ruin an administration, — we care very little which, for we are not party men; but it must soon be brought to a close, or the people will demand the cessation of hostilities in the deep-toned language of alarm and indignation, — alarm at the disregard of the nation's interests, and indignation at the sacrifice of moral principle.

The country will soon take this matter out of the control of selfish or weak politicians, and save its honor from further damage; or if it cannot do this, it will take a lesson from its own experience that will not be without its use. Peace is the only wise or safe policy for this republic. War will not expose us to the danger of conquest by a foreign power, but it will bring upon us the greater evil of the destruction of our virtues by our own hands. Peace is the only sound policy for all nations — the only policy that will enable them to expand the resources which they possess or to preserve the blessings which they now enjoy. Peace is the destiny of the world. War belongs to barbarism and Heathenism. Civilization and Christianity must rule the future, and they will secure the prevalence of pacific principles. When we are told that war is inevitable, we need only answer that Christianity is Divine.

E. S. G.

ART. III.—THE CHURCHES AND THE CHURCH.

WHOEVER reads the Gospels thoughtfully, and forms to himself an idea of Christ, his meaning and aim, from their records, must be struck with the huge incongruity between that idea and Christianity as it has existed outwardly in the world since the time of the Apostles,—the successive churches of our faith. We may safely affirm, that it was no one of these which Jesus had in his mind when he said, "On this rock will I build my Church." Above all, it was not that Church which claims emphatically to rest on this basis, and to be the fulfilment of this prophecy; which sees in its high priests the lineal descendants of that Apostle whom Jesus denominated the rock, and believes its pontificate, the Papal see of Rome, to be the seat actually occupied by Peter and transmitted by him.

There has been manifested of late, among Protestants in various quarters, a disposition to fall back upon this Church and to renew this claim in its behalf. In England particularly, during the last year, numbers of clergymen, and among them distinguished members of the Established Church, have formally joined the Romish Communion. Without attributing too much importance to this movement, we cannot but regard it as a very remarkable sign of the times. And yet we hardly know what it signifies. We can compare it to nothing but the act of a man who should close his shutters and light a candle at mid-day, or who should blindfold his eyes and suffer himself to be led about by a groping, imbecile guide who had lost the use of his through utter decrepitude. In some cases the motive professed, is the desire of finding a sufficient historical foundation on which to build an ecclesiastical institution. That members of the English Church in search of such a foundation should prefer Rome to England, is not surprising. For though Rome, no more than England, can claim to be the original, Apostolic institution, it has certainly a broader basis and a more imposing lineage. The error lies in seeking to found an ecclesiastical establishment at all, in flat contradiction to the spirit of that religion which says, "neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem," but "in spirit and in truth." In some cases it is a

matter of sentiment, — a lively fancy taken with the picturesque exterior of Catholic worship, and the charm of antiquity that hovers round a Church which once overshadowed the world, and which calls the “eternal city” its cradle and its home. But this charm, like the beauty of some picturesque but decayed city of the Old World, is better appreciated and enjoyed by the Protestant who looks at it from a distance than by the Catholic who lives in it. A Gothic ruin is a thing to visit, to gaze at and to muse on, but not to imitate, nor to dwell in. A feudal castle perched on some craggy eminence at the angle of a stream — a relic of those stalwart centuries which cradled the modern world — may well attract the poetic mind. The spirit of the past seems to brood over those grey walls. One would like to spend a summer’s day in such a spot, and dream of the days and deeds of old. But what should we think of the wisdom of him, who from mere love of antiquity should sell the house over his head, a comfortable modern house, suited to modern uses and wants, to go and burrow in a corner of some dilapidated Gothic ruin? No! Let by-gone be by-gone! Let the dead bury their dead! We will honor the past for what it has been. It shall be venerable to us as an object of contemplation, as a study and a treasure-house of wisdom, but not as a city of habitation.

The Church of Rome, although once a saving and beneficent institution, could never with propriety claim to be the Church intended by Christ. Although once a true Church, it could never be called *the* true Church. The true Church, among other qualifications, should be a catholic or universal Church; and that the Roman has never been. The phrase, “Roman Catholic,” is a contradiction in terms. So far as the Church was Roman, it was peculiar, limited, and ceased to be catholic. The Roman Church was never a universal Church from the time that it bore that name. It was always a schism, a fragment, as the name imports. The beginning of its existence was a schism. The beginning of its existence was the separation of the Roman patriarchate, with its dependencies, from the Greek patriarchate with which it had formerly constituted one Church. Even that Church, though calling itself Catholic, did not comprise the whole body of Christian believers. The Church had never been one since it first

became identified with the secular government under Constantine, and since, with the aid of secular authority, it attempted to establish a uniformity of faith. The first attempt of this kind, in the first Christian Council, broke the Church in pieces. Then, and at subsequent Councils, fragments were struck off and distinguished as heresies from the larger portion which called itself Catholic. In the fifth century the Roman Patriarch took upon himself to excommunicate the Greek Patriarchs for their participation in an edict of the Emperor Zeno,* the design of which was to reunite with the Church a portion of the Christian body which had been cast off as heretics at the Council of Chalcedon.† This edict was a catholic act, it was done in a catholic spirit. The Roman Patriarch in opposing it acted schismatically. And thus the Roman Church was a schism, a fragment at its very commencement; made so by its own act. The larger portion of a broken vessel is not less a fragment than the smallest. The Roman fragment of the broken Church was no more entitled to call itself Catholic than the Greek; and the Greek may, at this day, with far greater propriety than the Roman, claim to be the original Church, founded by the Apostles; seeing it has changed less than that with the course of time. But the claim in either case is absurd, for the Christian doctrine was already so modified at the time of the first Council, A. D. 325, by Platonizing Fathers and a Paganizing laity, that neither Peter nor Paul would have recognised their teaching in the Nicene Creed.

The Roman Church then, with all its pretensions, is neither more nor less than a *sect*. It cannot even claim to be the eldest sect. That honor, if it be one, belongs to the Nestorians and Armenians who were cast off by decrees of Councils before Rome became a separate Church. This is a point of little consequence in itself, but it becomes important in view of the claim preferred by the advocates of Rome to be the oldest Christian Communion; and when Protestants speak, in the cant phraseology of the times, of returning into the bosom of the mother Church, it behoves them to consider that, if the Church of Rome is the mother of the various Protestant sects, she is far from being the

* The Henoticon.

† The Eutychians.

eldest church. She is herself but one among other daughters of a mother long since extinct.

But the antiquity of a church is no argument, nor even a presumption in its favor. They who rely on it assume, that the nearer we approach Christ and his Apostles in the order of time, the nearer we approach them in the order of doctrine. But this is not the fact, unless we go farther back than any existing church can trace its history; in other words, unless we go back to the New Testament; in whose pages, whatever else we may find, we shall meet with no encouragement to return to the bosom of Rome. The doctrine of the New Testament is onward, and forever onward. "Forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forth unto those that are before." "Therefore leaving the rudiments of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection." "How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?"

Christianity, as a positive historical religion, is progressive. To maintain that it is perfected by any Council or number of Councils, that it is contained pure and entire in any creed or symbol or confession of faith, is a sin against the Holy Ghost. Christianity is progressive. Although in its essence and innermost spirit unchangeable — "the same yesterday, to-day and forever," — as an agent in time, it changes with the time. It advances with the progress of society. It adapts itself to successive periods of man's growth. Man as a race has a destiny to fulfil. Man as a race is made the subject of progressive education. He is sent into one school after another, to learn one truth after another as he is prepared to receive it. The Law, says Paul, "was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." It was only an external Christianity, however, for which that instruction prepared men, — better, more spiritual than the old Law, but still external, symbolical, compared with the teachings and spirit of Jesus. The Christian Church is another schoolmaster; the different forms of that Church are successive schoolmasters, to bring men to the true Christ — the wisdom and the power of God.

It is from this point of view that we must judge of the Roman Church, if we would form a true estimate of its value in time past, and the influence it has exercised on the mind and life of man. We must not judge it by the mind

of Christ as we understand it in this advanced age, but we must view it in connexion with the period in which it originated. We must not judge of it as a fulfilment of the Gospel; that it certainly was not. Gospel truth is one thing, and the Christian Church, during the greater part of its history, has been another and a very different thing. But we must take it for what it is, or rather, for what it has been and for what it has accomplished in time past. Viewed in this aspect, the Church of Rome will be found to have been, in its best days, a saving and beneficent institution. Though not the original, Apostolic Church, — still less, the Church which Jesus had in view, the realization of his idea, — it was once a true Church, and a saving institution among the nations, — we need not hesitate to say, even a divine institution. During all its forming period, until it attained its perfect development, — say till the close of the eleventh century, — its priests and leaders, for the most part, wrought in a divine spirit. Of course there were many exceptions, but this was the rule. It was the case with those who stand most prominent in its annals, the authors of those measures which contributed most effectually to its growth and power. They wrought in a divine spirit, and were divinely guided to the use of such means and institutions as were most conducive to the good of humanity, for the time being. If the Church did not express the deepest mind of Christ, it did express and satisfy the spiritual wants of the times. If it did not teach the pure truth, it was at least a faithful schoolmaster to bring men to the truth. It performed an important part in the education of humanity. It tamed the rude strength of the Gothic nations, and served, more than any secular changes or civil institutions, to unite different portions of the human family by means of a common faith. It would be easy to show, that every principle advocated by the Church prior to the close of the eleventh century contained a germ of truth, and that every important measure adopted by it contributed something essential to the well-being of the times. Even the supremacy of the Pope proved on the whole a benefit to Christendom, by furnishing a counterpoise to secular usurpation. Gregory VII., who consummated this supremacy and made the Church independent of secular authority by forbidding the priests

to receive their investiture from the hands of laymen, was probably actuated by a pure regard to the best interests of Christendom, in this and other measures which have usually been regarded as the offspring of personal ambition.

This distinguished Pope, the most able and one of the most devoted in the long line of Roman pontiffs, closes what may be regarded as the forming and growing period of that Church. With him, after six centuries of gradual growth, it reached the summit of its power, and after him it began to decline. Hitherto it had been a true Church. Its servants in name were its servants in fact. The Church was more to them than anything else. Its service was their first aim and their chief joy. And its service was identified with the good of the souls which it had in charge.

But now a new spirit took possession of the Church. Its chief servants were oftener actuated by personal ambition than by religious zeal. They wrought no longer in the spirit of faith, but in the spirit of hypocrisy and intrigue. Often infidels at heart and libertines in practice, they made their office a cloak for all manner of wickedness, and the good of the Church a pretext for all manner of extortion. Sensual enjoyment was the watch-word whispered in the Vatican; and it was soon reëchoed from the farthest convent-cell. How to procure that enjoyment at the expense of the laity, was a problem to be solved by all the expedients which priestly cunning could command. The most profitable of these expedients was the sale of indulgences; and this, accordingly, became the prevalent practise of the Popes in the period which immediately preceded the Reformation. The indulgence originated in a pecuniary fine which the Church imposed in certain cases, instead of penance. This custom had obtained, to a certain extent, in the better days of the Church, but degenerated in the hands of such men as Alexander VI., Julian della Rovera, and Leo X., into a written license to sin with impunity, on the payment of a sum proportioned to the offence.*

* Christ, said these men, did not take upon himself all the penalties of sin. There are some which still remain unpaid. These are the penances appointed by the Church and the torments of purgatory. Our indulgence absolves from both. The first we remit as Head of the Church, the second by our intercession as ambassador of God. But absolution cannot be given for nothing, an equivalent is necessary, which the Pope will devote to pious purposes.

Large editions of such licenses were issued from time to time, according to the pecuniary necessities of the Popes. These editions were purchased on speculation by travelling merchants, who retailed them at public auction. It is easy to imagine what must be the influence, on the minds of the people, of a venal salvation, — a salvation which could be purchased at auction. In its better days the Church was the friend and patron of learning. Indeed what little learning there was in the world existed almost exclusively in the bosom of the Church. But now, the Church persecuted learning, and especially theological learning, as a dangerous enemy. The reading of the Scriptures by the laity was prohibited by heavy penalties. The study of them in the original was considered a crime.*

Such was the Roman Church, — so degraded intellectually and morally, — when Luther and his contemporaries appeared and prepared the way for a new Church, or rather, a vast number of new Churches; each one of which approaches more nearly the idea of Christ, and may therefore claim, with greater truth, to rest on the foundation of the Apostles and to have Peter for its origin, than that of Rome; seeing there is no evidence but that of tradition, that Peter ever saw Rome, much less that he held a bishopric there. That any one of these Reformed Churches actually occupies this foundation, that any one of them is the one which Jesus had in his mind, none but a fanatic will assert. Approximation, more or less advanced, to that ideal Church, is all that any of them can claim.

Two truths, of last importance to the spiritual well-being of man, are involved in the Protestant Reform. One is the right of private judgment, the right to form our own faith from such materials as are given us, and especially from the Christian Scriptures. The other is intimately connected with it, and may be considered as a necessary inference from it, namely, that religion is not stationary, but progressive. And these are precisely the two points on which the

* The language of a Dominican, quoted by a writer of this period, illustrates the brutal ignorance of the lower clergy. "They have," says he, "invented a new language which they call the Greek; beware of it, it is the mother of all heresies. I see in the hands of some a book written in this language called the New Testament. It is a book full of thorns and poison. And as to Hebrew, whoever studies that becomes at once a Jew."

Christian world is at this moment divided. What is the controversy between Romanism and Protestantism, between Episcopacy and Congregationalism, between most Congregational sects and our own? It is, whether we shall form our religious opinions for ourselves, or whether we shall have them thrust upon us by human authority, in the shape of a creed. It is, whether we shall advance or stand still; whether we shall go on, according to our light, to unfold the Christian idea and to apply it to the social condition of man, or whether we shall stop short at some given exposition of it, and there set up our everlasting rest.

Protestantism, in its largest sense, means progress. The *protest* is against limitation, limitation by human authority; —against the presumption which says to the immortal mind, thus far and no farther! This is the meaning, if not the language of the Church of Rome, —limitation. The fatal error of that Church, the error against which the soul of humanity protests and will evermore protest, is not its theology. It is not the exposition of Christian doctrine given by the Council of Trent. It is not the ritual, nor the absolution, nor the mummary. These things would correct themselves, if the Church were not self-limited. The fatal error is the assumption of infallibility, the assumption of absolute, God-given authority to dictate and command in matters of belief. Whatever meaning that assumption might have had, when the Church was in advance of the average mind, it is a fatal error now; altogether contrary to the wants of the age in which we live, altogether incompatible with individual and social progress. The objection is not to the large demand which is made upon our faith. We must walk by faith and not by sight, in a vast number of cases, whatever Church we walk in, and though we walk in no Church at all; and we are miserable indeed, if we do not believe a great deal more than we can see. Nevertheless, we will walk by sight, even in matters of religion, where we have sight to walk by. Where we can see, we will not shut our eyes. We will use them as far as they may avail. We will not blind ourselves for the mere pleasure of groping in the dark. We will not complain, as some have complained, that "the Church has too much light." We will be thankful for all we have, and pray for more, not preferring the darkness,

but worshipping the God who "is light," and in whom is no "darkness at all." Not counting ourselves to have already attained, we will press forward to new revelations from him, the Father of lights. While we honor the past for what it has been, we will remember that our business is in the fleeting present, and our goal in the infinite future; that as our eyes are placed in front and not behind, and as our feet point in the same direction with our eyes, so it was intended that, morally and spiritually also, we should go forward and not backward. And we will trust that the same Providence which guided the old world, is present also to this, and that the same spirit which built the house wherein our fathers worshipped, will rear for their children also a temple worthy itself and them.

The protest, we repeat, is against the claim of the Church to supreme and absolute truth. It is true, the Protestant sects have, each in turn, repeated this claim in substance, while opposing it in form. While quarrelling with the fixed standards of other Churches, they have in turn, fixed standards of their own; while they claimed for themselves the liberty to advance as far as they had explored the ground, they have virtually said in their turn, "thus far and no farther." In this they have been false, without intending to be so, to the first principles of Protestantism. They have only *romanized* on a new foundation. There is no middle ground for a Church to stand upon, between the Catholic idea of infallibility, and that of individual conviction and congregational freedom. Everything between these stops short of a principle. Everything between these is a compromise, a half-measure, a position which contradicts itself. Every Church which sets up for itself a creed, a standard of faith, and makes that standard the condition of communion, is Popish so far forth. It has the fatal error of Popery without its palliation. It would be more consistent, if it went the entire length of the Romish doctrine and claimed infallibility at once. There are but two Churches in the world, that of spiritual authority and that of spiritual freedom. The Christian who would be consistent, must choose between these two. But though Protestant sects have been false to themselves, Protestantism is none the less true in principle and spirit. The meaning of the reformer is one thing, the meaning of the reform as a Prov-

identical movement is another thing. The meaning of Protestantism, however falsified and lost sight of by Protestants, is still the same. It is a protest against spiritual domination, a cry for liberty and progress.

Is Protestantism then the true Church? Or can Protestantism alone give us the true Church? We think not. Liberty and progress are essential elements of a true Church, but they do not constitute a Church in themselves. Moreover, Protestantism, though it embodies a vital principle and a great truth, contains also a vicious element which, if left to itself, would be fatal to religion as a social institution, and which is incompatible with the existence of a permanent Church. That element is disunion. The tendency of Protestantism is centrifugal. It tends to diverge, to scatter, to divide and subdivide without end. It requires the counterpoise of a centripetal principle to prevent social religion from becoming extinct through endless division. That principle which Protestantism wants, and which Romanism has, is union. The true Church must be catholic, it must embrace the whole. It must gather into one all the elements of Christianity which are scattered abroad. It must recombine the scattered members of the body of Christ. It must attract all Christian sects, all who call themselves Christians, around a common centre, to co-operate for common ends. It must unite the Roman and the Protestant elements,—the social and the individual. It must be union and progress, union and liberty. Protestantism alone is liberty and progress without union, Romanism alone is union without liberty or progress. A true Church must combine both. It must reconcile the spiritual *rights* of the individual with the spiritual *interests* of society. It must find a form of union which shall not compromise individual liberty, and which shall not only be compatible with progress, but the most effectual means of promoting it.

What must be the centre and nucleus of such a union? Evidently, not a creed or system of doctrine. The experiment of uniting on a creed has been often tried, and always failed in the long run. It always must fail, in consequence of the imperfection of language and the innate diversities of the human mind. The bond of union must not be a speculative idea, but a practical one. The mischief hitherto

has been, that men have attempted to unite on speculative grounds. No permanent union is possible on that basis. When men begin to speculate, they fly asunder in every direction; but when they come to act, they are drawn nearer together. The reason is obvious. Speculation is a business which every one can perform for himself; but in order to act with much effect, we require the aid of our fellow-men. Thus we see that the practical reforms of the day unite Christians of the most opposite opinions in one aim, and draw them nearer to each other.

Here, we think, we have a key to the solution of this problem and a guide to the true Church. Christianity is a practice, not a speculation. Consequently, practical reform, the regeneration of society in the image of Christ, the putting away of sin and social evil from the world, — this must be the centre and nucleus of Christian union. What is the fundamental idea of Christianity, that which all will allow to be so? Christ a manifestation of the Divine nature; a union of the human and the Divine; a Divine humanity. This is an idea around which all who call themselves Christian, whoever will call themselves Christian, can unite. And closely connected with this, and a necessary inference from it, is the call to us, to all the followers of Christ, to aspire to a divine humanity, to unite the divine with the human in their lives; in other words, to lead a divine life, to remove all the obstructions which lie in the way of such a life, all social evils and abuses — war, slavery, oppression in all its forms, — to break every yoke, to undo every burden, to put away all sin. In a word, reform, the regeneration of society in the Christian image, — this is practical Christianity. In this all practical Christians can unite; must unite, if ever the ends for which Christ lived and died are to be accomplished on earth. Such a union would be a true Church, Catholic and Protestant in one. And such we conceive to have been the Church which Christ intended to rear. Apostolic faith, the faith which was in Peter and his fellow-laborers, — this is the rock on which it must be built; and Christ, the Divine humanity, — this is the end for which it must strive. Such a Church would be nothing less than the reorganization of society on a Christian basis. A Church is the highest to which society can aspire. Higher than the State,

which unites men as mortals, on the ground of self-defence, for mutual protection in selfish pursuits; the Church is the union of men as immortals, on the basis of love, for common and everlasting ends.

There are not wanting, to our eyes, hopeful indications of such a Church in the signs of the times. Among these we may mention the movement which is now making among the Catholics of Germany; — a movement which, while it casts off the yoke of the Romish hierarchy, still retains the Catholic name and the Catholic idea of union, and whose aim, in the language of its leader, is to “perfect the work which Protestantism began, and to carry out Christianity to its legitimate results.” We see farther indications of such a consummation in the tendency of Christians of all denominations in our own land to unite in the great work of social reform, and, casting aside sectarian distinctions, to make zeal for the cause of mankind, not orthodoxy of opinion, the test of a Christian.

There is a spirit at work in the affairs of men, mightier than all ecclesiastical establishments and sectarian combinations. The old lines are everywhere disappearing, old sects are breaking up. The tide of humanity is sweeping away these petty barriers, and bearing us and our institutions on to a higher mark and a better day. A time is coming, when the only Christianity that shall pass current shall be the practical Christianity, which believes in a heavenly kingdom to be realized on earth, in the social perfection of man, and which labors, in the spirit of Christ, to promote it; and when the only heresy that shall not be tolerated, shall be the practical unbelief which opposes that consummation. A time is coming, when there shall be but one Church — the Catholic Protestant Church of Christian union and Christian progress; but one order of priesthood — the hierarchy of the wise and good; but one standard and law — “the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.”

F. H. H.

ART. IV. — MUNFORD'S ILIAD.*

It is impossible to present Homer in perfection to the English reader. Our language does not admit of it. The attempts that are made, with whatever ability, can attain but a partial success. The method that is chosen, in securing its particular advantage, must forego some other that would perhaps be but little less desirable. Macpherson undertook to translate the *Iliad* into literal prose. It sounds so much like his *Ossian*, that we have sometimes wondered that it found no more favor among the admirers of that singular mixture of falsehood and fact. We have never seen, however, any reprint of it from the elegant quarto volumes, in which it was first given to the public. We are even inclined to think that many will be surprised to hear of the existence of such a work, so entirely has it been forgotten. The magnificent paraphrase of Pope is in everybody's hands, and continues to be read with delight. If it is not Homer, it is at least one of the finest poems in our language. No one will think of rendering the tale of Troy into heroic couplets after it. Cowper followed with his blank verse, which we think has received less attention and praise than it deserves. One cause of this comparative neglect undoubtedly is, that the splendid poetry of his predecessor threw his humbler style into the shade. Mr. Munford, in his new version, has adopted the same measured but unrhymed lines. He tells us in his preface, that when he began his work, and indeed till it was considerably advanced, he had not even heard of Cowper's translation. When it came into his hands, it does not seem to have discouraged him, but rather to have filled him with the expectation of greatly surpassing it. In this, we think that he has failed altogether; and in several respects, we fear that he did not sufficiently weigh his ability against his enterprise. "Pope," he tells us, "has equipped" his Homer "in the fashionable style of a modern fine gentleman"; while "Cowper displays him 'in rags unseemly,' or in the uncouth garb of a savage." He proposes "to introduce him in the simple, yet graceful and

* *Homer's Iliad*. Translated by WILLIAM MUNFORD. Boston: Little & Brown. 1846. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 452 and 524.

venerable costume of his own heroic times." In both these criticisms there is more pretension than justice. The fame of Pope's version remains untarnished after the lapse of much more than a hundred years; and Cowper's, though it may lack nobleness now and then, shows the hand of a poet in every part. Now this is just the hand that Mr. Munford had not to bring to his task. "I have not imitated Milton," he says, "or any other writer. With a boldness which some may consider presumptuous, I have made an attempt to adopt a style of my own." We must frankly say that this "boldness" appears more clearly in his ambition than in his verses; and that this peculiar "style" is one of the most ordinary that we are apt to meet. It is not elevated, not strong, not simple, not discriminating. If free from gross faults, it does not bear any large stamp upon it, or show any considerable signs of a high and true culture. With occasional exceptions to the contrary, it is prevailingly clumsy and flat. For example, read such lines as we take at a venture from the close of the twenty-second book:—

"So spake the weeping fair one; groans and sighs,
To her's responsive, from the females came."

There are many hundreds like them; and though we may not see much in them to find positive fault with, they are so mean and unskilful as to give little promise of excellence in more important passages. The Homeric line at this place is a single one, and of the very plainest kind. Cowper also expands it into two, thus:—

"So, weeping, she: to whom the multitude
Of Trojan dames responsive sigh'd around."

Which is certainly not in his neatest manner, and sufficiently weak; but yet its marked superiority over the other must be obvious to everybody. And this is but a sample, the better for being so humble, of what might be illustrated to any extent in comparing the two versions together. "Weeping fair one" is not according to Homer; any more than "venerable dame" is a proper epithet for the goddess Thetis, in that beautiful description in the First Book, where, sitting in the depths of the sea, she rises from it like a mist, in answer to the prayer of Achilles. Before leaving the subject of Cowper's translation, we would say again,

that it merits something better than the slighting manner in which we commonly hear it referred to. With our estimate of his poetical abilities, it does not seem to us to fall below them. It should rather add to his reputation than detract from it. It is an ingenious and scholarly performance. We are sorry that we cannot say so much for the work before us.

We ought not to forget, and we do not, that it was written more than twenty years ago, when materials were much less ample than now for doing it well; and that it has been published posthumously, thus denied the advantage of the author's last corrections. At the same time, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that he has not availed himself of the critical aids that were easily accessible to scholars even so long ago as when he wrote. "The Lexicon of Schrevelius" is often appealed to, as if it were quite an authority, and there is no sign of the slightest acquaintance with what the German scholars had done. We hardly know how to account for such a deficiency in the learning that was requisite for the acceptable fulfilment of his task, when we consider the classical zeal and high purpose with which it was undertaken. This deficiency, however, is not conspicuous till we come to the notes, which are appended to each book, and help considerably to swell the volumes. Serious, therefore, as such a deficiency is, it is less striking than the general want of a fine taste in the language of the poem itself. The words are often ill-chosen and ill-arranged, turgidly prosaic, without dignity or just force, giving a heavy, lumbering expression to the meaning that they seem struggling hard to convey. We would not be understood to imply that there are not here and there passages very well done; but we think we commit no injustice in saying, that the description just given is applicable to the greater part of the work. The style is usually more like the attempt of a young student than the finish of an accomplished writer. If any one still thinks our judgment too harsh, we commend to his attention the following passage, taken almost at random:

"But furious Hector, calling loudly, bade
His Trojans to the ships to rush forthwith,
And disregard the spoil: Whatever man
I notice from the ships of Greece remote,
I doom to instant death." — xv. 453 — 457.

It is unnecessary to point out particular blemishes in what is altogether so helplessly poor.

We have observed several mistakes in the pronunciation of proper names. The standard here is so absolutely fixed, that one is surprised at any departure from it. And yet sometimes excellent scholars are found tripping. Both Pope and Cowper, for instance, place the accent on the second syllable of Briareus, as Mr. Munford does after them. It is true that the Greek accent is so placed; but the scanning of the lines where it occurs, both in Homer and Hesiod, does not permit us to pay regard to it. Virgil would seem to have set the question completely at rest for those who were inclined to raise any:

"Et centumgeminus Bríareus, ac bellua Lernæ."—Æn. vi. 287.

No English custom or authority is sufficient to set aside the old classic evidence that speaks for itself. We cannot say that we are satisfied, either, with the liberties that this translator sometimes takes with his author, as if he would make out something better than the original. When Agamemnon sends an embassy to Achilles, in the ninth book, offering him among other things the choice of either of his three daughters in marriage after the war was over, if he would forget his resentment and rejoin the army, Mr. Munford thus makes mention of these "dames";—which word, by the way, he is very apt to confound with "damsels," and rather comically sometimes:—

"Chrysothemis,
With ev'ry grace adorn'd; Laodice,
My people's joy; Iphianassa too,
A queen of beauty."

The careful reader might suspect that some trick was played upon him here, in this very unhomeric expansion. He ought to be told, therefore, that the names of these ladies fill just one line of the *Iliad*, without the least syllable of description added to either of them. And yet "the queen of beauty" and the rest are paraded before us two several times, in the commission of Agamemnon and in the speech of Ulysses, who of course, herald-wise, repeats what he was charged with. Another example of this spreading out beyond the original document is found in the eighteenth book. A whole page is filled with the fanciful

qualities of the sea-nymphs of Thetis, borrowed from the signification of their names, while almost nothing beyond the simple names themselves is heard of from the old bard. The translator excuses himself for saying so much more than is set down for him, by imagining that a literal rendering would be "insufferable." We think his manner of dealing with the "puzzling passage" much more so. We feel bound to say, indeed, of his version from beginning to end, that it is most wearily diffuse, as unskilful compositions usually are.

If from the text we pass to the notes, we must pronounce them to be, to the last degree, vapid and superficial. Their illustrations are without instruction, and they contain no criticism that is entitled to the least respect. We meet also, here and there, a little theology of an exceedingly narrow and questionable sort. Mr. Munford, as we have already said, does not seem to have made any advance towards the highest fountains of thought and information upon the subjects which he has been so venturesome to treat. Father Eustathius and Madame Dacier furnish the most learned references that he has to entertain us with. His remarks are therefore of necessity meagre; for he draws but little from his own resources, and that of no very choice quality. He is evidently no master of that kind of philosophy which belongs to his undertaking. He even leaves us in doubt whether he was aware of the existence of any such. His views of classical mythology, besides their inadequateness, are singularly confused. He mixes together the most dissimilar theories, apparently without being sensible of any inconsistency between them. The same personage stands at one time as a real historical existence, and at another is only a name representing one of the departments of nature. For example, we are told, (Vol. II, p. 518,) that the education of Achilles by Phoenix and Chiron, "with the instructions of his mother Thetis, made him indeed one of the most accomplished princes of the age in which he lived"; while we had read, nine pages before, that "Juno, the goddess of the air, is said to have been the nurse of Thetis, because the sea is partly supplied with water by rain from the clouds." The most amusing part of this note is what follows, explaining the account of this "maritime goddess" bringing to her son the arms that

were divinely forged by Vulcan. He supposes that after the hero had lost his armor by the death and spoiling of his friend Patroclus, he was so lucky as to buy a bran-new suit from some trading vessel that happened to come along. Thetis was therefore said to have procured it for him. We have heard of a certain Euhemerus, who would see in all the gods and goddesses nothing but deified men and women, and pretended to have found the tomb of Jupiter. He turned the whole of Olympus into an actual but forgotten history, which he traced to an inscribed column in the island of Panchaia. We know also of one Dr. Paulus, in our own day, who endeavored to resolve all the miracles of the New Testament into actual but perfectly natural events. But we remember nothing in the kind that is more diverting than this naturalizing of the Homeric muse.

We have alluded to the theological references that are scattered about in the notes of our translator. Free-will and fate come in for a place more than once; and from a slight mention of the calamities of mankind he takes occasion to enlarge upon "the character of human nature degraded by sin"; and speaks of "a wicked man as indeed the most loathsome and abominable object in the universe, except a fallen angel; doomed to suffer the inconceivable miseries of never-ending punishment." (Vol. II, p. 228.) Again, the only excuse he can make for Homer's introducing into his poem the blood-thirsty wish of the son of Peleus, in the sixteenth book, is, that "the heart of man is desperately wicked, before it is regenerated and purified by divine grace." His greatest enterprise, however, in this direction, is his explication of that remarkable passage in the ninth book, giving a personification of prayers as the daughters of Jove. "They were called lame," he says, "because imperfect in themselves, and not sufficient to entitle men to the favors of the gods; for which reason sacrifices were considered necessary. So in the Christian system, faith in the great sacrifice of atonement by the Redeemer is needful to give efficacy to prayer." (Book ix. Note ww.) It is easy for any scholar to perceive that the commentator is here wholly off the track.

Neither can we think Mr. Munford much more fortunate in the specimens that he has given us of Scriptural criticism. He is fond of quoting the Bible, and frequently

draws parallels between its descriptions and those of his favorite bard. We cannot say that these are usually drawn with a discriminating judgment. We will select our examples of this only from the 124th and 125th pages of the second volume. One of the notes takes advantage of the expression that Hector was restored to his senses by the will of Jove, after the terrible blow he got from Ajax, to remind his readers that "in like manner, our blessed Saviour said to the man afflicted with leprosy, 'I will, be thou clean'; and the effect was immediately produced." We are sure that no irreverence was intended by so exceptionable a comparison, for the author seems to be a seriously religious man; but the least we can say of it is, that it is in very bad taste. The other instance is still worse. It is where Apollo looked the Grecian charioteers full in the face, and shook his dreadful ægis, and shouted his battle-cry, thus throwing them into dismay and confusion. "It is worthy of observation," Mr. Munford tells us, "that this sublime passage has a strong resemblance to one in the book of Exodus," (xiv. 24,) where it is said, 'And it came to pass, that, in the morning-watch, the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians, through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians.' " Now it happens, that this "strong resemblance" is a most striking contrast. The effect in Homer is produced by rapid motion and an appalling cry; while the image in the Exodus owes its whole sublimity to its repose and utter silence. "The Lord *looked* unto the host of the Egyptians." Another word would have spoiled the whole effect of the passage. If we would seek for a second description as sublime, it must be in the Scriptures themselves; and there we shall find one even more so. It is the 32d verse of the civth Psalm:—"He *looketh* on the earth, and it trembleth; He *toucheth* the hills, and they smoke."

Our annotator seems doomed to be unfortunate whenever he applies his acuteness to the sacred volume. We see this infelicity in another of its phases, where he speaks of the friendship between Achilles and Patroclus as resembling that of David and Jonathan. He adds this new verse to the fine funeral lament of King David: "As a mother loveth her only son, so did I love thee;" and then goes on with this extraordinary piece of simplicity: "This last

admirable expression of David is not in our English translation of the Bible, but I found it in that by Sebastian Castellio, [Castalio,] in Latin. Why it was omitted in the former I know not, being unacquainted with the Hebrew. It seems to be worthy of the subject, and bears a characteristic mark of being genuine." (B. xxiii. Note b.) The case does not invite any comment. A similar simplicity, though in another way, seems to mark note "d" of the tenth book, where Agamemnon is represented as looking towards the plain of Troy and seeing "innumerable fires." "The meaning is," says Mr. Munford, "that in thought, or in the mind's eye, meditating intensely, he viewed them, for being in bed in his tent, he could not see them in reality." We hope it was not mischievous, if we felt inclined to see "a strong resemblance" between these words and the speech of the Governor of Tilbury fort to his daughter: —

"Hold, daughter! Peace! This love hath turn'd thy brain!
The Spanish fleet thou canst not see — because
It is not yet in sight."

We have seemed to ourselves called on to say thus much, on the score of literary justice. We certainly have no disposition, or temptation, to be ungenerous towards the well-meant labor of an estimable and honored citizen. But we are afraid that the tendency of most of the criticism of the present day is towards favor and flattery. The truth is kept back, in order that friends may be gratified. This is not honest, to begin with; and we consider dishonesty to be not only a crime, but a treason in the republic of letters. We are, moreover, persuaded that the reigning temper of adulation is extremely unfriendly to a high literary standard. Works of ambitious mediocrity, from whatever quarter they come, should be plainly spoken of as no better than that. This should be done for learning's sake. We think, too, that there should be more wariness in publishing the writings of those, who are no longer here to say what they would wish should be done with them. The last remark does not apply very well, it may seem, to this translation of the *Iliad*, since it was prepared for the press by its author, a short time before his death. But Virginia has lately seen the reputation of one of its most eminent sons sadly exposed, by an indiscreet publication of

his papers after his lamented decease; nor do we feel by any means confident, that the book now in our hands would have seen the light, at least in its present form, after a lapse of twenty years, if the author had lived so long to pursue his favorite studies and enlarge his views in relation to them.

The typographical execution, like that of everything that comes from its publishers, is excellent. We cannot help, however, pointing out two great faults; which we do not charge to their account, for they undoubtedly printed the manuscript as it was put into their hands. One is, that the number of each Book is not marked at the top of the page. The other is, that the page itself is always one uniform, solid column; with nothing to distribute it before the eye; no resting-place where one may hope to halt awhile; no gap of a breathing-place through the close lines. It is enough to bewilder and exhaust one, only to look at it. We never before saw a book without paragraphs, and hope never to see another.

N. L. F.

ART. V.—SPHERE OF HUMAN INFLUENCE.

CHARLES BABBAGE, in his "Ninth Bridgewater Treatise," has a chapter concerning the permanent impression of our words upon the air,—a chapter which none have ever read without a thrill of mingled admiration and fear; and which closes with an eloquence that were worthy the lips of an orator, though coming from a mathematician's pen.

Would that Babbage had touched, in his fragmentary treatise, upon some of the inferences which may be drawn from the Newtonian law of gravity, inferences which would probably have been as new to most of his readers, as those which he, with so much acuteness, draws from the law of the equality of action and reaction.

The motion of which Babbage speaks in the chapter to which we refer, is undulatory, communicated by impulse and requiring time for its transmission; and the startling result of his reasoning comes from the never dying character of the motion, keeping forever a record of our words

in the atmosphere itself, always audible to a finer sense than ours; reserved against the day of account, when perchance our own ears may be quickened to hear our own words yet ringing in the air.

But motion is not only enduring through all time, it is simultaneous throughout all space. The apple which falls from the tree is met by the earth; not half way, but at a distance fitly proportioned to their respective masses. The moon follows the movement of the earth with instant obedience, and the sun with prompt humility bends his course to theirs. The sister planets with their moons are moved by sympathy with earth, and the stars and most distant clusters of the universe obey the leading of the sun. Thus throughout all the fields of space, wherever stars or suns are scattered, they move for the falling apple's sake. Nor is the motion slowly taken up. The moon waits for no tardy moving impulse from the earth, but instantly obeys. The speed of light which reaches the sun in a few minutes, would be too slow to compare with this. Electricity itself, coursing round the earth a thousand times an hour, can give us no conception of the perfectly simultaneous motions of gravity. There are stars visible to the telescopic eye, whose light has been ages on its swift-winged course before it reached this distant part of space; but they move in instant accordance with the falling fruit.

True it is, that our senses refuse to bear witness to any motion other than the apple's fall, and our fingers tire if we attempt to unite the long list of figures, which our Arabic notation requires to express the movement thereby given to the sun. Yet that motion can be proved to exist, and the algebraist's formula can represent its quantity. The position of every particle of matter at every instant of time, past, present, or to come, has been written in one short sentence, which any man can read. And as each man can understand more or less of this formula of motion, according to his ability and his acquaintance with mathematical learning, so we may conceive of intelligent beings, whose faculties are very far short of infinite perfection, who can read in that sentence the motions not only of the sun, but of all bodies which our senses reveal to us. Nay, if the mind of Newton has advanced in power since he entered heaven with a speed at all proportioned to his intellectual growth

on earth, perhaps even he could now with great ease assign to every star in the wide universe of God the motion, which it received from the fall of that apple which led him to his immortal discoveries.

Every moving thing on the earth, from the least unto the greatest, is accompanied in its motion by all the heavenly spheres. The rolling planets influence each other on their path, and each is influenced by the changes on its surface. The starry systems wheeling round their unknown centre move in harmony with each other, and bend each other's courses, and each is moved by the planets which accompany it in its mighty dance. Thus does this law of motion bind all material bodies in one well balanced system, wherein not one particle can move but all the uncounted series of worlds and suns must simultaneously move with it.

Thus may every deed on earth be instantly known in the farthest star, whose light, travelling with almost unbounded speed since creation's dawn, has not yet reached our eyes. It only needs in that star a sense quick enough to perceive the motion, infinitely too small for human sense, and an analysis far reaching enough to trace that motion to its cause. The cloud of witnesses, that ever encompass this arena of our mortal life, may need no near approach to earthly scenes, that they may scan our conduct. As they journey from star to star and roam through the unlimited glories of creation, they may read in the motions of the heavens about them the ever faithful report of the deeds of men.

This sympathetic movement of the planets, like the mechanical impulse given by our words to the air, is ever during.

The astronomer from the present motion of the comet learns all its former path, traces it back on its long round of many years, shows you when and where it was disturbed in its course by planets, and points out to you the altered movement which it assumed from the interference of bodies unknown by any other means to human science. He needs only a more subtle analysis and a wider grasp of mind to do for the planets and the stars what he has done for the comet. Nay, it were a task easily done by a spirit less than infinite, to read in the present motion of any one star the past motions of every star in the universe, and thus

of every planet that wheels round those stars, and of every moving thing upon those planets.

Thus considered, how strange a record does the star-gemmed vesture of the night present! There, in the seemingly fixed order of those blazing sapphires, is a living dance, in whose mazy track is written the record of all the motions that ever man or nature made. Had we the skill to read it, we should there find written every deed of kindness, every deed of guilt, together with the fall of the landslide, the play of the fountain, the sporting of the lamb, and the waving of the grass. Nay, when we behold the superhuman powers of calculation exhibited sometimes by sickly children long before they reach man's age, may we not believe that men, when hereafter freed from the load of this mortal clay, may be able in the movement of the planets or the sun to read the records of their own past life?

Thou who hast raised thy hand to do a deed of wickedness, stay thine arm! The universe will be witness of thine act, and bear an everlasting testimony against thee; for every star in the remotest heavens will move when thy hand moves, and all the tearful prayers thy soul can utter will never restore those moving orbs to the path from which thy deed has drawn them.

T. H.

ART. VI.—HOPKINS'S LECTURES.*

THE city of Boston owes a large debt of gratitude to the founder of the Lowell Institution. His original plan was characterized by a wide, far-seeing wisdom, as well as benevolence; and he was scarcely more happy in its conception, than in the arrangements which he was able to make to ensure its being carried into successful execution. The name of Lowell has through a succession of generations been an honored one in this Commonwealth; and if it be a grateful spectacle to see children rear monuments in mem-

* *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, before the Lowell Institute, January, 1844.* By MARK HOPKINS, D. D., President of Williams College. Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1846. 8vo. pp. 383.

ory of their fathers, it is a still more beautiful one to see them emulating and equalling them in their public usefulness.

Were we to frame in imagination some scheme which in the long run would secure the greatest amount of good, it must, as an essential condition of success, be one which, in some way or other, should bring the mass of the community into close contact with its best minds. To accomplish this is difficult; but wherever it is not done, society is split up into castes determined not by artificial rules, but by differences of ideas. They stand on different levels of thought. There is no gulf so deep, no wall so high between different classes, as this. And the most wretched class that swelters and starves in the cellars and lanes of the great European capitals, is not to be pitied so much because it is doomed to have the body fed on scanty and unwholesome food, as because the mind is fed, or famished, on a lower and poorer kind of ideas. On the other hand, there is no greater good done than when the truths, to which the best minds have laboriously attained, are made the property of all. To spend an hour with a great and good man, standing on his level and looking at the world from his point of view, will often give an impulse and direction to a person which will not be lost through life. And when the members of a community, drawn from all callings and classes, come into contact with such men, and hear them treat elaborately those subjects in which they are most interested, it will be found before long, that their ideas have spread widely, that they have done much to determine the starting-points and direction of thought and speculation, and to a greater or less degree colored the general mind. It is an influence not immediately seen, and not easily measured. But if familiarity with the best models raises the standard of taste, familiarity with the best minds raises the standard of thought and attainment; and that community will always be found to be in advance of others, where the best instructed men, instead of forming a class by themselves, are constantly in their various departments brought before the people at large.

To aid in promoting this object is the purpose of the Lowell Institute. The lectures delivered in this institution differ entirely from the common popular lectures, in that

they consist of courses of sufficient length to allow of an elaborate treatment of the subjects brought forward. The lecturer attracts those who have affinities with himself, and the hearers are prepared to listen, from interest either in the subject or in the speaker. Since the institution went into operation, in 1839, a large number of courses have been delivered on the most important subjects, and by men holding the first rank in their several departments. The attendants on these several courses have varied from one to several thousand persons. Thus conducted, the Lowell Institute is a University for the people. Few Universities in the world could boast of a better series of lecturers, and fewer still, of so many attendants on the lectures. Nor is it a well founded objection, that they are not heard by the most ignorant classes of society. It is far better, that the audiences should be composed of those who are able to appreciate the best thoughts of the best minds. Such persons become the teachers of others, and the ideas which they have received spread insensibly through the mass of society.

The volume at the head of this article contains twelve Lectures by President Hopkins on the Evidences of Christianity. It possesses great merits. The style is clear, forcible, not infrequently rising into eloquence, and always marked by a business-like character, proceeding by the shortest way towards the main point, as if the writer were too much in earnest to waste either his own or other's time on matters of secondary importance. Having at the outset stated, with the good sense that characterises the whole volume, the precise object which he purposes to accomplish, he examines the question of the antecedent probability or improbability of miraculous communications from God, and then shows how far miracles are susceptible of proof, and how far they are the fitting evidence of a Divine revelation. Having disposed of these preliminary topics, he proceeds to an exhibition of the internal and the external evidences of the truth of our religion. In treating of the internal evidences, his great object is to show that Christianity is adapted to the wants and capacities of human nature, and thus contains in itself the highest evidence of its truth, and while doing this, to bring to view those circumstances which make it impossible to account for the existence of

such a system without attributing to it the supernatural origin which it claims. This branch of the subject is especially important, for it presents the kind of evidence which to nearly all men is the most convincing. It meets the wants of those who have neither time nor opportunity to examine the historical evidence. It requires no preparation, to feel its force, but a knowledge of Christ's teachings and some experience of life. Any man who possesses honesty and good sense is able to understand and appreciate it, and to such a one, it seems to us that, if duly weighed, it must be overwhelming.

The great characteristic of a true religion must be, that just in the same degree as it is obeyed, it is suited, from the nature of the truths which it teaches, the duties it enjoins, and the motives it presents, to carry man upward towards the perfection of his nature. We reject the various systems of Paganism without examining their evidence. It is sufficient for us to see, that if they are fully obeyed, the best of them, instead of raising man upward to the perfection of which he is capable, will mutilate and distort his moral being and leave him at a very low stage of moral progress. Many of them tend to repress his best capacities, while they stimulate his passions and lower propensities. We see that a man may be better than these religions. They therefore do not contain the true laws for the growth of the soul. Without further examination we reasonably and logically pronounce them to be false. A religion, on the other hand, which sets forth the true laws of man's progress, and which contains nothing that is not in entire harmony with these laws, bears in itself an unquestionable seal of its truth.

Will Christianity bear this test? It has been in the world eighteen hundred years. We are not obliged to speak theoretically, but may try it by the severer test of experience. Tried in this way, how far is Christianity fitted to be the guide and helper of man to the perfection of his nature?

The most important point in this inquiry is, to show that it is adapted to the conscience. A true religion must, obviously, be fitted to quicken and develop the moral nature, and at the same time to guide its activity aright. President Hopkins argues most convincingly, that Christianity

meets this demand, — that it is adapted to the wants of the conscience, in the first place as a perceiving power, and, secondly, as a power capable of improvement. The first and invariable effect of Christianity, when practically received, is to arouse the conscience, to make it more sensitive to sin, more quick and true in its perception of right. To discover its adaptation to the conscience as a power capable of improvement, we have only to look at the history of the world. There is as much difference between the conscience of a New Zealand cannibal and of Fenelon, as between his intellect and that of Newton. The Sandwich Islanders when first visited by Europeans had scarcely any words by which to express the higher virtues, so little were the moral sentiments developed. But wherever Christianity has prevailed, the moral judgments and moral standards of mankind have constantly improved.

Again, Christianity, as must obviously be the case if it be true, is adapted to the wants of the affections. It would not be difficult to show from an analysis of the mind, that the laws by which our religion would control, and the ends to which it would direct, the affections, are such as are necessary to their healthiest growth and highest development. But experience speaks more impressively than theory. Words cannot describe what Christianity has done for the affections. In a dreary and wintry world, it has opened regions of perpetual summer. It has hallowed domestic bonds. It has created the word *home*, or given it a meaning which it never had before. Woman, throughout the Heathen world the slave of men's lusts or love of ease, Christianity has raised to an equality with man. By its revelations of immortality and by laws and influences bearing on this point, it sometimes seems to have raised even parental love from a merely animal instinct into a spiritual affection. Nay, more; it has not only purified, but has strengthened the affections. Take the strongest of all, that of parents for their children, and who can doubt that Christianity has immensely increased its strength. There is no more significant evidence of it, than a fact of whose existence it is hardly possible to form a conception, — the wide prevalence of infanticide. Throughout a vast part of the Heathen world, child-murder has been held to be venial. Nor has this horrid practice been confined to

the ignorant and barbarous. Solon allowed it at Athens; in Sparta, by the laws of Lycurgus, the mother was required to surrender up for exposure her feeble and sickly offspring; and, still more strikingly, this same practice was to form a chief balance-wheel in the ideal republic of Plato. Even in Christian countries, wherever Christianity loses its hold to any considerable extent on the minds of the people, it is found that the character of human affections is lowered. They lose their sacredness, become sensualised, and so of necessity are enfeebled. What a horrible commentary on this general statement is found in the thronged Foundling Hospital of Paris. And one of the reasons given for sustaining it is still more horrible, — that it is a great nursery of human life — that it is necessary to prevent infanticide.

The adaptation of Christianity to the intellect is not to be overlooked; for although it is not its purpose to give rules for mental culture, we have a right to assume that a true system of religion must be, at least incidentally, favorable to the growth of the mind. That it has been so with Christianity, cannot be doubted. So far as its requirements are yielded to, it brings men out from under the dominion of sensuality and the low vices which dwarf and imbrute the intellectual faculties. It sets an especial value on truth, by making it the foundation of all human good, and so directly fosters that principle which is to the intellect what the love of right is to the moral nature, namely, the love of truth. Wherever it exists in its purity, it protects the freedom, and insists on the responsibility, of the individual mind. It brings up before all believers problems, fitted peculiarly to task the faculties, whose practical importance secures for them the most serious consideration. And, above all, it makes familiar to the humblest Christian a class of truths beyond all others the most sublime, the most elevating and purifying and inspiring, on which the mind can be employed. The study of the classics, of natural philosophy, of history, of political economy, doubtless tends to enlarge and liberalize the mind. But their influence in this direction is not to be compared with that which results from devout meditation on the Divine character, from the contemplation of nature and man in their relations to a Providence, the investigation of the great problems of philanthropy and the questions of private duty

which our faith presents. This much may be said of Christianity, that it stimulates the mind to investigate, and at the same time reveals for its contemplation the sublimest and the most practical truths. It makes it familiar with great principles; and this not in the way of barren speculation only, but by insisting on their application to one's daily life. The necessary consequence is, that the general culture is most liberal, and civilization in its best sense most advanced, where Christianity has the most power over the general mind.

Without specifying further the particular cases of adaptation, they may all be summed up under one general view. There are no principles in human nature which are intended to be eradicated. They are all good, when kept within their proper limits and controlled by proper laws. But there are many which need excitement, all need to be guided, and all to be restrained. Excitement, guidance, and restraint;—the great problem for all moralists and philosophers has been, to frame a system of living, which should so unite these characteristics and be so adapted to man, as to lead him on to his legitimate perfection and end. Yet so complex is human nature, and so multiplied are human relations, that no philosopher has ever succeeded in framing a system which could in any degree meet this want. The best of them has been some wild Eutopian dream, which would have put the world "out of gear" had it been acted on for a day. Yet that problem which has baffled the wisdom of sages, Christianity has completely solved. President Hopkins devotes an able lecture to the proof of this point. Yet it hardly needs any proof. Nearly all skeptics even, while denying the divine authority of the religion, have been forward to acknowledge the perfection of its morality, and to confess that as a system of excitement, guidance and restraint, not only has experience detected no imperfection in it, but that just as far as men come under its influence, it must carry them forward towards the perfection of their nature.

The first general conclusion to be drawn from this view of the adaptation of Christianity to human nature is, that as a system for the moral government of life, it is the true one. A system, which contains those laws—and none else—which, obeyed, conduct man to the perfection of

his nature, must of course be true. We believe in its truth, just as we do in the truth of the system of astronomy which explains and harmonizes all the planetary motions.

The second conclusion is, that taking into view the connection of the moral precepts of Christianity with the religious truths which enforce them, the character of the system as a whole, the character and claims of Christ, and the circumstances by which he was surrounded, we are compelled to admit that it had the supernatural origin and authority which it claims.

We have not attempted to give even an abstract of the argument presented by Dr. Hopkins. Our purpose has been, merely to indicate the general tenor of a portion of it, in the hope thereby of commending the volume to our readers.

The concluding Lectures, which treat of the external evidences, contain a clear statement of the points to be proved and of the evidence for them. But on the whole, they strike us as inferior to those on the internal evidence. They add nothing to what might be found in many other volumes. They lead us to think that the lecturer was pressed for time, or did not personally feel any strong interest in this part of his work, but added them for the purpose of making the statement of evidences more complete. His heart is evidently in those Lectures which treat of the adaptation of Christianity to the nature and wants of man. Notwithstanding all that has been written on the subject, no treatise occurs to us which presents this branch of Christian evidences more clearly and forcibly. If there be nothing absolutely novel in the view which is taken, it is presented with so much freshness and vigor and felicity of statement, that it seems to us a real addition to our theological literature.

The external evidences require much more space than President Hopkins could give to them, and for this reason as well as the one suggested above, and because in an age of universal publication we want only a man's best thoughts, we think that the volume would be better if all were omitted except what relates to the internal evidences. It would make a complete treatise by itself, and one which we should be glad to place as a first book on Christian Evidences in the hands of any one who was desirous

of candidly investigating the grounds of belief. Still we ought to say, that President Hopkins's volume is better suited to animate the faith of a disciple than to convince the skeptic. He takes his position within the Church, and writes for the benefit of those of whose sympathies he is already sure, rather than for the satisfaction of those who stand without the circle of Christian brotherhood. And in regard to the external evidences, we should prefer that the believer, having examined the first part of President Hopkins's labors, should then read some writer who has treated this department of the subject more elaborately. E. P.

ART. VII. — POETRY.

I. HYMN OF WORSHIP.

"The sea is mighty, but a Mightier sways
His restless billows." — BRYANT.

GREAT is the Lord.
God of earth's empires, and her nations all !
To him alone be our deep homage paid ;
Let us bow down and worship him alone !
The mountains that rear up their awful heads
Into the clouds, tremble when He is near.
The sea, in all its billowy might, is stilled
When He doth speak. The broad, blue arch of heaven
Was fashioned by his thought ; — Orion, and the Bear,
And the broad belt of stars that spans the universe,
And all that stud night's sparkling turban, sprang
Existent at His will. The sons of Earth,
Whose millions, clothed with life, dwell on the land,
Or plough the ocean in ten thousand ships,
And those uncounted multitudes that sleep
In the pale realms of Death, are His creation.
Angel and high archangel, that around
His throne lift up their voices in eternal praise,
Came thronging from the drear abyss of Nought,
Through His omnipotence. The golden sun

That lights the day, and lovelier moon that shines
So calmly through the watches of the night,
He placed on high.

His presence fills all space : —
As well the starless void, as where the throng
Of sparkling planets roll : — as well the forest
Where timid silence dwells, as the dense mart
Where nation trades with nation. His path is laid
In the lone wastes that round the Pyramids,
And Tadmor's mouldering columns, stretch away
Beyond the horizon's verge. The eternal snows
That rest on Himmalee, list to His footsteps.
The isles that on the bosom of the waters
Are, rose from their ancient depths to smile
For Him. The strong leviathan that sports
Amid the tempest, cleaving with his sides
The mightiest wave, — the huge behemoth,
Trampling the cedars, — each obey His voice.
The forked lightnings terrible, that dart
Through the cleft heavens, are messengers
Of Him ; the thunder, frightening the stunned earth,
Is but His whisper. The Lord is mighty !
All things are His ! He made, and holdeth all !

The eagle mounting with unfaltering wing
To pierce yon purple cloud, or reach the height
Where on the lonely crags he builds his home,
Is yet no more the object of God's care,
Than the weak sparrow fluttering in the vale.
He giveth to the lion sustenance,
And for the hare he bids the clover bloom.
The weary ox, panting from recent toil,
Drinks from His brooks, and from His bounty feeds.
The Lord is good ! He loveth all his works !

The loftiest seraph, whose resplendent eye
Pierces eternal mysteries, — the idiot boy,
That wanders on the hills without a thought,
And scarcely knows the name men call him by, —
Both rest within the bosom of His love.
The wretched poor who want for daily bread,
Ask not in vain of Him. The mourner's tear,
Wrung from a heart of anguish at the graves

Of loved ones, He perceives, and giveth balmy hope
Of immortality.

The wild tornado,
Wrenching the strongest pines from their firm roots,
And hurling them abroad in terrible wrath, —
The earthquake heaving with its awful strength
Whole continents, — are emblems of his might ;
Yet he doth guard the pelican's young brood
While she is absent at the far-off pools,
And granteth strength to her returning wing.
Great is his might, and great his goodness ! Let
One swelling hymn of adoration rise,
From all that on the land hath habitude,
And all that liveth in the ocean's deeps,
To Him who ruleth from eternity !

R. H. B.

II. LINES ON THE DEATHS OF LITTLE CHILDREN.

I.

I CAME where, in its snow-white shroud,
The form of little Willie lay ; —
How my heart ached ! I wept aloud —
For anguish I could scarcely pray.
“ Oh God ! and is this all,” I cried,
“ That 's left of little Willie now ? ”
And bending down by his bedside,
I kissed that cold and stony brow.
I looked again ; — “ How calm,” I said,
“ He slumbers there in sculptured grace !
Peace visits now that weary head,
And pain has fled that placid face ! ”
Dear Willie ! what a weight of grief,
What agony I've borne for thee !
But oh, unspeakable relief !
To feel, thy spirit now is free : —
To feel that thou art safe and well
From pangs that rend mortality ;
That thou art gone, sweet lamb ! to dwell
'Mid the pure pastures of the sky.

And yet we do not deem thee far,
Though, from yon world of cloudless bliss,
Thy spirit beckons like a star *
To us, frail sojourners in this :

For He is present everywhere,
Whose arms of love enfold thee round,—
Draws near and whispers, in our prayer ;
“ Behold, the child ye lost, is found ! ”

II.

'T WAS in the time of early spring,
When the small rain falls soft and fast,
When the first vernal warblers sing,
In hope that winter's hour is past ; —

'T was then our darling's grave we made,
Where earth was moist with nature's tears ;
And there, in silent sorrow, laid
The blighted hope of future years.

The *blighted* hope? Oh, say it not !
There came no “ voice of words ” from Heaven ;
Yet, to the listening heart, methought,
A sign of peace from God was given.

Though stillness brooded o'er the land,
And but the pattering rain was heard,
Yet, out of sight, but near at hand,
Carolled a solitary bird.

So sadly sweet, so sweetly wild,
The fitful, solemn, cheerful note,
Above the grave of that dear child,
Gushed from the little songster's throat ;

Methought her own pure spirit might,
E'en at that hour, be hovering near,
From God's all-present world of light
Whispering the mourner holy cheer.

* Shelley's Monody on Keats.

Shall we not own, with grateful trust,
Such earnest of a Father's love,
And looking upward from the dust,
Rejoice in Him who reigns above?

While o'er the infant's open grave
The early birds their carols sing,
And summer boughs in beauty wave,
And sunbeams fall and flow'rets spring;

Shall we not hear His voice, who said,
To dry the eyes that tears bedim:
"God is the God, not of the dead,
For all are living unto Him."

III.

"WELL with the child?" Ah, yes, 't is well
With that bright creature evermore, —
Gone up, 'mid seraph bands to dwell,
With God, on yonder starry shore.

Well with the child? Ah yes, 't is well,
Though marble-cold the lily brow,
And though nor sage nor seer can tell
Where soars the mind, that beamed there, now.

Well with the child? Ah yes, 't is well,
Though fixed in death that speaking eye.
A shadow o'er the spirit fell —
It passed — a star is in the sky!

Well with the child? Ah yes, 't is well
With her, the joyous, guileless one!
Toll not for her the gloomy knell,
Though gilds her grave the morning sun.

Well with the child? Ah yes, 't is well,
And well with us who mourn, if we,
By penitence made pure, might dwell,
Sweet child of God, with Him and thee!

C. T. B.

REVELATION.

WHEN one who walks by night in fear
Through woods and wastes without a road,
And tries with anxious eye and ear
To find the way to his abode,

Perceives at length its distant light
Becoming brighter as he moves,
And bringing full before his sight
The image of the home he loves;

His fears depart, his spirits rise,
His step grows strong, his breathing free,
His rough way smooth, and on he hies
To meet the friends he longs to see.

'T was thus, through many a weary day,
That many a weary traveller trod,
While darkness overspread the way
That leads to happiness and God ;

But lo ! a brilliant, blessed light
Streams from the "house not made with hands,"
Which, hidden long from mortal sight,
At length revealed in glory stands ;

And travellers guided by its rays,
No longer anxious, doubtful, roam,
But tread with joy the rugged ways
That lead them to their heavenly home. E. W.

PRESS THOU ON.

ONWARD, Christian ! though the region
Where thou art, be drear and lone.
God hath set a guardian legion
Very near thee ; — press thou on.

Listen, Christian ! their hosanna
Rolleth o'er thee — "God is Love."
Write thou on thy red-cross banner,
"Upward ever — heaven's above."

By the thorn-road, and no other,
 Is the mount of vision won.
 Tread it without shrinking, brother;
 Jesus trod it; — press thou on!

By thy trustful, calm endeavor, —
 Guiding, cheering, like the sun, —
 Earth-bound hearts thou shalt deliver;
 Oh! for their sake press thou on.

Be this world the wiser, stronger,
 For thy life of pain and peace.
 While it needs thee, oh, no longer
 Pray thou for thine own release.

Pray thou, Christian, daily, rather
 That thou be a faithful son, —
 With the prayer of Jesus, "Father,
 "May thy will, not mine, be done."

S. J.

ART. VIII. — FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CONGREGATIONALISM.*

THE Christian Church, — the principles and forms of its organization, the rights and proper qualifications of its ministers, the modes and the efficacy of a true administration of the offices and ordinances of religion, — in short,

* 1. *History of Congregationalism, from about A. D. 250 to 1616.* By GEORGE PUNCHARD, Author of "a View of Congregationalism." Salem. 1841. 12mo. pp. 388.

2. *A Church without a Bishop. The Apostolical and Primitive Church, Popular in its Government, and Simple in its Worship.* By LYMAN COLEMAN, Author of "Antiquities of the Christian Church." With an Introductory Essay, by Dr. Augustus Neander, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Boston. 1844. 12mo. pp. 432.

3. *The Puritans and their Principles.* By EDWIN HALL. New York. 1846. 8vo. pp. 440.

4. *Congregationalism. A Discourse delivered before the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, Boston, May 28, 1846.* By ALVAN LAMSON. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 8vo. pp. 30.

5. *Puritanism: or, a Churchman's Defence against its Aspersions, by an Appeal to its own History.* By THOMAS W. COIT, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N. Y., etc. New York. 1845. 12mo. pp. 527.

all the subjects included under the general term "ecclesiastical polity," — occupy at the present moment a large portion of the religious discussions and religious interest, not only of our own community and country, but of the whole Christian world. Questions that have slumbered for nearly two centuries, and which most Protestants at least considered definitively settled, have been revived ; and many signs indicate that the old battle of the Reformation, the conflict between Church authority and Gospel liberty, between the Bible as a rule to the individual, and the Church as the only competent and qualified interpreter, must be fought again, with something of the earnestness, the determined courage, the watchful and unfaltering zeal, that marked the original contest.

To have matters of form and organization excite so much attention, may seem, at first, no very favorable evidence of the state of practical religion. It may be thought to augur ill for the prevalence of an inward, spiritual, living faith, a heartfelt reception of the great moral truths of the Gospel, and a faithful application of them to life and character. Dispute and discussion on these topics may seem idle and mischievous, elevating into importance what is insignificant in itself, withdrawing thought and interest from that which is of first moment in religion and most directly addressed to the heart and conscience. But this would be an erroneous conclusion. We admit, under one aspect of them, the utter insignificance of forms and ecclesiastical organization. They are of no account in the sight of God. We do not believe that anything *outward* in religion is in itself alone of the slightest consequence in his regard, or that the efficacy or the acceptableness with Him of any external religious service depends upon the manner or the office of the person performing it. He cares not in what language, or in what posture the prayer be offered, provided it come from the heart with a sincere and earnest utterance. He cares not when, or where, or how, or by whom baptism be administered, or when, or where, or how, or by whom the word of life be divided and spoken, or the bread and the wine, symbols of the body and the blood of the crucified Redeemer, be offered and received by humble and penitent sinners, provided there be a sincere, reverent purpose, a devout, childlike, trustful faith in the soul. If this purpose

and this faith be absent, the most splendid, regular and orthodox administration of Gospel ordinances and institutions fails of acceptance and efficacy. If they be present, the most simple and, according to our ecclesiastical conventions, the most irregular administration of them is accepted and blessed. "Ye shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father *seeketh* such to worship him;"—this is the great principle and rule of Christ in regard to worship. This spiritual worship of the heart is always accepted. It breathes an efficacy into all the forms under which it may embody and express itself.

In this respect forms and ecclesiastical organization are of too little moment to become questions of discussion and contention.

Under another aspect, however, they become matters of consequence in their effect upon man, upon the progress of truth and freedom, of enlarged and elevated views of Christian duty and character. They may promote or retard the spiritual growth of the soul and the best influences of the Gospel upon society. There is a connection between the form and the spirit of religion. All Christian history teaches that the kind of religious character that prevails in a community, is more or less determined by the kind of ecclesiastical organization that is established in that community, is an expression of the religious ideas comprehended in that organization. The difference between Catholic Mexico and Congregational New England is to be attributed mainly to the different ideas embraced, the different influences exerted by the different modes in which the Christian Church has been organized and the Christian religion administered, in the two countries. A Roman Catholic or a Puseyite Episcopalian must have a conception of the Gospel, of its essential spirit and influences, a conception of the important elements of the Christian character, of "the covenanted mercies of God" and of the conditions of the Divine acceptance and favor, widely different from those entertained by the Congregationalist. The religious character of any man will be modified, his religious conceptions more or less moulded by the ecclesiastical organization under which he has been educated, and which from habit or principle he approves and helps to sustain.

As the influence Christianity exerts, the results it produ-

ces on human society, are thus greatly dependent upon the manner and the forms under which it is administered, ecclesiastical organization becomes not an insignificant speculation, but an important and practical question, the agitation of which is by no means to be regarded as an unfavorable symptom in the public mind. It is not a matter of regret, but of lively satisfaction, that this subject excites much interest, awakens many inquiries at the present day. So far as books can do it, these inquiries seem in a fair way to be answered, this interest to be fed. Within the last few years, in addition to the numerous pamphlets and occasional discourses that have been published, the title of one of which is given above, several substantial works on this subject have issued from the press, sufficiently popular in their character to interest and instruct the common mind, yet exhibiting the fruits of much study and research, embodying so much of the learning connected with it as was necessary to a satisfactory and conclusive argument. Among these we would refer our readers particularly to the three first named at the head of the present article. They are all similar in their character, bearing upon the same general subject, yet having each its own distinct plan and purpose, starting from a different point, but arriving all at the same general conclusions.

The Catholic's sneer at the Protestant, "Where was your religion before Luther"? was well answered in the reply, "Where yours never was,—in the New Testament"; but Punchard in his "*History of Congregationalism*" gives a different, though not a better answer. He shows that Congregationalism is not the child, but the father of the Reformation, that it is no new thing, numbering only one or two centuries, but as old as the Gospel, always having its friends, its advocates, and an existence in the Christian Church. He traces the general principles of Congregationalism through the Novatians, the Donatists, the Paulicians, the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Lollards and Wickliffe, down to their full development by the Puritans of New England. He shows that from the first, in every age and in almost every country, there has been more or less dissent from the authority, the doctrines and the worship of the Catholic Church; and that this dissent, though often embracing other things, and having in each case something

peculiar to itself, has always been based upon, or has to a greater or less extent involved, most of the leading features of modern Congregationalism. He gives the following account of the opinions of Constantine, the father of the Paulicians.

"In the first place, adopting the New Testament as a perfect guide to religious truth, he utterly disregarded and repudiated all 'the opinions, gospels, epistles, and acts,' which had come to be of nearly or equal authority in the church, with the Scriptures themselves. 2. He maintained, that 'the New Testament ought to be read assiduously, and by *all* the people;' in opposition to the teachings of the church, that the priests alone should be intrusted with the sacred treasure. 3. Not finding in the New Testament a recognition of the three orders of clergy — bishops, presbyters, and deacons, — he rejected this dogma of the church as unscriptural. He believed that all religious teachers were 'equals in rank;' and that they should be 'distinguished from laymen, by no rights, prerogatives, or insignia.' 4. The authority of councils to govern the church, he did not recognize; neither indeed, were any such institutions known among his followers. 5. In a word, he utterly rejected the whole hierarchal system of church government then in vogue.

Such were some of the results of Constantine's investigation of 'the creed of primitive Christianity.' These discoveries entitle him to a prominent place among the ancestors of the denomination whose history we are tracing.

In connection with his primitive views of church order and government, he discovered and developed other views of religious truth equally sound. As, for example — the folly and sin of worshipping the Virgin Mary, — of looking to the mediation of saints and angels for favor with God, or of idolizing the work of the sculptor or painter; — the worthlessness of all *relics*, whether bones or ashes; — the impiety of all worship of the cross, a piece of mere wood; — and the absurdity of regarding the eucharistic wine and bread as anything but 'the gifts of nature and the symbols of grace,' the *emblems* of the body and the blood of Christ. That all these important truths were at once discovered and proclaimed by the father of the Paulicians, I do not assert; but, that these were the distinguishing peculiarities of this sect, is perfectly apparent from the accounts given us by the very enemies of this Protestant sect. And if so, the taunt of the Romanists — that 'the Protestants were the progeny of the Paulicians,' — will scarcely be regarded as a reproach." — pp. 80 — 82.

We have made this extract simply as an illustration of what every page of Punchard's work goes to establish, that the leading principles of Congregationalism have always had an existence in the Christian Church. Often persecuted, but never destroyed, often crushed by authority and borne down by force, but never extirpated, these principles have always had friends and advocates, a noble band of martyrs, who, amidst the darkest periods of corruption and under the overshadowing power of the Roman hierarchy, preferred liberty to spiritual bondage, and clave unto the simplicity that is in Christ.

The title of Coleman's work, — "A Church without a Bishop. The Apostolical and primitive Church, popular in its government and simple in its worship," — sufficiently indicates its character and the particular object at which it aims; which is, to overthrow the claim of diocesan Episcopacy to a divine right and an exclusive participation in "the covenanted mercies of God," — to show that Congregationalism in its principles and spirit, its usages and forms, most nearly corresponds with the Scriptural account of the Apostolic and primitive churches, and is most conducive to the cultivation of an enlightened piety and the prevalence of just and enlarged views of the nature and purpose of the Christian religion. To this end he enters into an examination and criticism of those portions of Scripture that relate to the organization, the discipline and forms of worship of the primitive Church, and into a review of ecclesiastical history to exhibit the beginning and progress of the departure from them, and to unfold the usurpations, the character and tendencies of Episcopacy. He examines and objects alike to the hierarchical organization and the ritual worship of the Episcopal Church. His objections to its ritual worship he sums up in the following propositions. 1. The use of forms of prayer is opposed to the spirit of the Christian dispensation. 2. It is opposed to the example of Christ and his Apostles. 3. It is unauthorized by the instructions of Christ and his Apostles. 4. It is contrary to the simplicity and freedom of primitive worship. 5. It was unknown in the primitive Church. His objections to its hierarchical organization are embraced in the following particulars. 1. It is a departure from the order of the Apostolical and primitive churches. 2. It had its origin

not in Divine authority, but in human ambition. 3. It removes the laity from a just participation in the government and discipline of the church. 4. It creates unjust distinctions among the clergy, whose character and profession is the same. 5. It gives play to the bad passions of men. 6. It is exclusive and intolerant in its spirit, assuming itself to be the only true Church, and its clergy the only authorized ministers, and its own, the only valid administration of Christian ordinances. 7. It is monarchical and anti-republican.

Upon this last point he remarks that: —

“Great objection was made to the introduction of Episcopacy into this country, on account of its monarchical principles and tendencies, so entirely counter to the popular spirit of our government and our religion. It was received at last only on condition of making large concessions to the spirit of our free institutions. In the revolutionary struggle, great numbers of that denomination, and a larger proportion of their clergy, remained fast adherents of the British Crown. Indeed the monarchical spirit of Episcopacy and its uncongeniality with our free institutions is too obvious to need illustration. Our fathers came here to establish ‘a state without a king or nobles, and a church without a bishop.’ They sought to establish themselves here, ‘a people governed by laws of their own making, and by rulers of their own choosing.’ And here in peaceful seclusion from the oppression of every dynasty, whether spiritual or temporal, they became an independent and prosperous Commonwealth. But what affinity, what sympathy has its government, civil or religious, with that of Episcopacy? The one republican, the other, monarchical; in sympathy, in principle, in form, they are directly opposed to each other. We doubt not that the members of that Communion are firm friends to our republican government; but we must regard their religion as a strange, unseemly anomaly here; — a religious government, arbitrary and despotic, in the midst of the highest political freedom; a spiritual despotism in the heart of a free republic!” * — pp. 319, 320.

* A distinguished American prelate, Rev. Dr. Hawks, has claimed for the hierarchical organization of the Church a close congeniality with the organization of our Federal and State Governments, making the Bishops correspond to the Governors of our several States, the House of Bishops to our United States Senate, the vestrymen and lay delegates to Conventions to the members of the House of Representatives. It is certainly a matter of surprise, that a claimant of “Apostolic succession” should resort to an argument so weak, an illustration so defective. What resemblance is there between our Governors, who are chosen annually and derive authority from election by the people, and Bishops, who *hold office for life*

By those who have Puritan blood in their veins, by those especially who can trace back their descent to any one of that "noble army of martyrs," the Pilgrims of the Mayflower, Dr. Hall's book, "*The Puritans and their Principles*," will be read with more interest probably than either of the other volumes we have noticed. The design of the work, as stated in the "advertisement," is "to set forth the causes which brought the Pilgrims to these shores; to exhibit their principles; to show what those principles are worth, and what it cost to maintain them; to vindicate the character of the Puritans from the aspersions which have been cast upon them, and to show the Puritanic system of Church polity,—as distinguished from the Prelatic,—broadly and solidly based upon the word of God, inseparable from religious purity and religious freedom, and of immense permanent importance to the best interests of mankind." Persuaded beforehand of the truth of these propositions, Puritan ourselves by descent, by education and by the convictions of personal faith, we have, of course, read Dr. Hall's book with a mind predisposed to acknowledge the force of his arguments and to adopt his general conclusions. Making all due allowance for this favorable prepossession, in sober judgment, we think he has successfully accomplished the broad design at which he aimed, as fully as it could be done within the compass of four hundred pages. He begins with a brief survey of the religious condition of England previously to the time of Wickliffe, and describes the life and character and opinions of that extraordinary man, the persecutions to which these opinions

and claim to derive authority from a divine right, and an official efficacy for their acts through the grace of an uninterrupted "Apostolical succession?" What resemblance is there between the United States Senate, whose members hold office for six years, who as a body have a limited executive and legislative power, and as individuals in their particular States have no power at all, and the House of Bishops, who hold office for life, who are supreme, each individually in his own district, and in their associated capacity over the whole land, having all executive authority, the expounders of all laws that exist, with an absolute veto upon any proposed to be made. The comparison entirely fails in some most important particulars. There is, in fact, no resemblance between the two things compared. Introduce the distinctive features of the Episcopal hierarchy,—office for life, with a union of executive, legislative and judicial functions in the same body,—and ours would no longer be a free republican government. The old Venitian oligarchy would be found to have been the very essence of liberty and purity in comparison with it.

were exposed in himself and his followers, and the influence they exerted in preparing the way for the Reformation in England. He then traces the origin and progress of that Reformation through the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, exhibiting the conflicting influences, the unworthy motives, the shameless compromises, through which that Reformation ended in the establishment of a Church, Calvinistic in its articles, Popish in its liturgy, spirit and forms, and subsequently, as sarcastically, but truly said by Lord Chatham, "Arminian in its clergy." The rise of Puritan principles during this period from the seed planted by Wickliffe, their gradual development and growth amid peril and persecution, the sufferings endured, the patience, firmness, steadfast zeal for liberty and truth, manifested by those who maintained these principles, their struggles for existence and toleration under James I. and Charles I., their triumph during the period of the Commonwealth, and the circumstances under which, previously to their being defeated and borne down in England by the restoration of Charles II., they had secured an asylum and a refuge on these shores in the establishment of the churches of Plymouth and Salem, germs of mighty and magnificent results,—all this is briefly but graphically unfolded, without the omission of a single important fact or principle, and in a way to impress the reader with the truth of Hume's admission, that to the Puritans alone, "the English owe the whole freedom of their Constitution," and make him feel that the history of their principles, their perseverance and their achievements, is one of the noblest chapters in the records of humanity.

Having given this historical exposition of "the Puritans and their principles," Dr. Hall proceeds to examine the validity of these principles and to discuss the questions at issue between the Prelatic and Congregational organization of the Church. He examines into the materials, structure, and discipline of the Church; aims to show that no national, provincial or diocesan Church is recognized in the New Testament; that as to earthly rule, it is a republic, and not a monarchy; that the Apostles, being extraordinary officers of the Church, have properly no successors; that two orders,—deacons, to "serve tables" and manage the secular affairs, and bishops or presbyters or pastors, (dif-

ferent titles of the same person,) — constitute the only officers of the Church spoken of in Scripture, elected or appointed by those to whom they minister; that the Gospel is a scheme of salvation, not through the intervention of a human priesthood, and a valid administration of sacraments, — which is the Prelatic idea, — but through justification by faith, requiring the soul to embrace and obey truth, which is the Congregational idea. In conclusion he examines the comparative tendencies of the two systems, and in respect to the principles and institutions of the Puritans, is “quite willing to point to their results in New England, and to ask whether it would be any loss to mankind, should such principles and institutions be extended throughout the world.” This portion of the book, (as indeed the whole volume,) is prepared with great ability, and as a brief, comprehensive and conclusive statement of the argument against the character and claims of Prelacy, it could not perhaps be better done. It may be thought possibly, that in one or two instances Dr. Hall is rather severe upon the prelatists, and that he indulges occasionally in a vein of satire, humorous and almost caustic, hardly suited to his subject. But, recollecting that Dr. Hall lives in Norwalk, the severity will be pardoned probably by those who have read Bishop Brownell’s Charge, and are familiar with the recent bearing of Episcopacy towards “*dissenters*” in Connecticut; and, as to the satire, it must be admitted that some of the claims and principles of Episcopacy are so ridiculous, that ridicule seems the strongest, if not the only argument with which to meet them. Lest we should do injustice to Dr. Hall in the minds of our readers, we lay before them one or two passages, as examples of what we have alluded to. They will perceive the force of his argument in each case, and we are persuaded, will not find much fault with the manner in which it is presented.

Speaking of Bishops and their ordination, he says :

“It is absolutely certain, that for a hundred years after Christ, the name Bishop, whether used by Apostles or Fathers, signified the Pastor of a Church; never a person holding a degree above that office.

And yet, I apprehend, that till quite recently, the mass of the common people, who have entertained Episcopal views, have rested upon the name Bishop, in the New Testament. Till re-

cently the mass of Episcopalians have not dreamed that their Diocesans were not Bible Bishops, but veritable Apostles. The views of their learned men were confused and contradictory. The learned Dr. Hammond maintained that all who bore the title of Bishops or Presbyters in the New Testament, were Prelates; and that none of the second order were ordained during the Apostolic history. Dodwell on the other hand maintained, that Bible Bishops were simple Presbyters; and that no Prelates were ordained till in the second century. Owen observed, two centuries ago, that 'the most learned advocates of Prelacy begin to grant, that in the whole New Testament, Bishops and Presbyters and Elders are every way the same persons in the same office,' (vol. xx. p. 394). At the present day, all well-informed Episcopalians fully admit this to be true. Thus Bishop Onderdonk, in his work on Episcopacy, says (p. 12), 'it is proper to advert to the fact, that the name Bishop, which now designates the highest grade of the ministry, is not appropriated to that office in the Scripture. That name is there given to the middle order, or Presbyters; and all that we read in the New Testament concerning Bishops (including, of course the words 'Overseers,' and 'oversight' which have the same derivation), is to be regarded as pertaining to the middle grade. * * * It was after the Apostolic age that the name Bishop was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first, * * * and when we find in the New Testament the name Bishop, we must regard it as meaning the Bishop of a parish, or a Presbyter. The Bishop of a diocese, or the highest grade of the ministry, we must seek there, not under that name, and *independently of any name at all.*' * * * 'The word Bishop,' — 'in Scripture, means a *Presbyter*, properly so called.'

With this view, Chapman, Chapin, Bowden, and all modern Episcopal writers fully agree.

This, however, is a point in which the framers of the Prayer-Book were unfortunately 'overseen.' In searching the Scripture for something to read at the ordination of a Diocesan Bishop, they could find nothing to the purpose at all, save one or two passages which use the word Bishop; and in which, it is now unfortunately discovered, that the word signifies no diocesan at all, but the simple Bishop or Pastor of a single Church; a mere Presbyter. But there it stands, as the Epistle to be read at the ordination of a Diocesan: 'This is a true saying, if a man desireth *the office of a Bishop*, he desireth a good work.' 'A Bishop then must be blameless.' Or as a substitute for this, the passage in Acts xx. is set down, 'from Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church;' 'And said, take heed * * * to the flock which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers' (original *ἐπισκοπους* — Bishops). And our good

Diocesans at the ordination of a brother diocesan—in full canonicals and with all gravity, continue to read these passages, as though the word Bishop here meant (as they know it does not) a diocesan Bishop, and not a simple Presbyter! Why do they do this? Why do the people suffer it? Are they willing to pass this word Bishop, knowing it to be, for their purposes, base coin? or are they to be slaves, in perpetuity, to an old form, which they know is—in relation to the purpose for which they use it—a falsehood? or is it because, forsooth, some Scripture must be had, and they may as well use this for want of a better? Surely, surely, if a Diocesan be such an essential corner-stone and pillar to the very existence of a Church, some Scripture ought to be found which can, by some decent pretext, be used with some pertinency at his ordination. Surely, surely, if Apostles had successors, it is wonderful that the record should be made so abundantly of inferior officers, but no record of the ordination of a successor Apostle! If there is such a record, pray let us have it in the Prayer-Book. If there is none, then tell the people plainly at such an ordination, that a deed is doing, for which you find no warrant or example to read them from the Word of God.”—pp. 311, 312.

Again, in treating of Apostolical succession he writes thus.

“The Apostle Paul says, ‘Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.’ How strangely Paul talks, cries the Priest of the Apostolical succession: ‘Sent me not to baptize!’ Why ‘the true economy of the Christian religion,’ says Bishop Brownell, ‘takes’ men ‘from the kingdom of Satan,’ and from ‘children of wrath’ it ‘transfers them *by baptism* into the family, household and kingdom of the Saviour!’ Paul sent not to baptize! Why, Christ sent *me* to *baptize*, cries the High Churchman: preaching is but a subordinate affair. And thereupon, Bishop Whittingham raises his voice: ‘Ministerial intervention for the forgiveness of sins, is the *essence* of the Priesthood.’

‘And hath given us the ministry of reconciliation,’ says the Apostle Paul. What, then, is the essence of that ministry? Baptisms? Confirmations? Sacraments? Priestly absolutions? Ministerial interventions? So says the Apostolical succession. But the Apostle Paul denies it. He talks not of the sacraments of reconciliation; but when he speaks of the ‘ministry of reconciliation,’ he adds, ‘And hath committed unto us the *word* of reconciliation.’ ‘So then,’ cries the Apostle Paul, ‘Faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the *Word of God*.’ ‘Of his own will begat he us by the *Word of Truth*.’ Baptismal regeneration! Paul makes a distinction heaven-wide between

baptism and regeneration: 'For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.' Circumcision (or baptism, its substitute) then is no part of the new creature, and does not, in this respect, avail 'anything.' In the account of Apostolical succession, however, baptism availeth everything: it takes the children of wrath and 'transfers' them into the kingdom of God.

The scheme of Paul makes nothing of priestly intervention, and much of faith: it makes very little indeed of any priestly prerogatives or interventions, in the matter of forgiveness of sins. Accordingly he says, 'Who then is Paul, or who is Apollos, but ministers *by whom ye believed?*' Who is Paul! Who? *Our* ministers are more than that: they are ministers by whose priestly interventions and valid sacraments ye were 'transferred from the kingdom of Satan, into the household, family and kingdom of Christ.' Who is Paul? who is Apollos? — *Our* ministers are somebody. They have received their commission from Bishops, who have received their commission from other Bishops, who have received theirs from others, clear back, till the authority comes at last directly from the Apostles.

Paul was an Apostle himself. His commission came through no dubious links of a dubious succession. He was not compelled to show a diploma of power received from a succession running back through monsters of iniquity all over blackened with lust and crimsoned with blood. He was an Apostle 'neither by man nor through man,' but by the direct calling of God. And yet Paul could say, 'so then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.' He cuts up the claims of High-Church Prelates by the roots, and throws them to the winds. He rejects the dogma on which they build their arrogant claims, and counts it another Gospel.

Such is the dogma of Apostolical succession *as a doctrine*: false, contradictory to the Scriptures, and subversive of the Gospel: the very opposite, and fundamentally opposite, to the scheme of salvation preached by the Apostles, and recorded in the Word of God.

Let us now test it by applying it to practice.

A man wishes to examine the grounds of his hope of personal acceptance with Christ.

The Bible says, 'Let a man examine himself.' 'Examine your own selves, *whether ye be in the faith*. Prove your own selves.' O no, says the Churchman; — not your 'own selves'; — not 'whether ye be in the *faith*;' — but examine the Diploma of your Priest: examine whether ye be *in the Church*; in the words of our Right Reverend Father in God, Bishop Hobart; 'Let it be thy *supreme care*, O my soul, to receive the sacrament of the body and blood of the Saviour, only from the hands of

those who derive their authority by *regular transmission* from Christ.' 'Where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church, by participation of its ordinances at the hands of an *authorized priesthood*, is the indispensable condition of salvation.'

It will not do, therefore, for the devotee of Prelacy to 'know nothing but Christ and him crucified.' The Gospel, alone, cannot afford him a valid promise of salvation. It is equally important for him to show something about 'the Church,' and the 'endless genealogies' of the 'succession.' The diploma of his priest is of equal consequence to him with the Gospel; since, if the pedigree of his priest is defective, he can have no more assurance of salvation than a heathen. And though it would appear somewhat ridiculous, for a Christian priest, when a poor sinner asks, 'What shall I do to be saved?' to hold up his spiritual pedigree for that sinner's examination; yet, to be consistent, he ought in all reason never to omit it. He should take the table of the genealogies, as officially published by the Tract Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or by Chapin, and holding it up before the inquirer, he should say, 'Behold here, the security for salvation, through the Gospel preached and sacraments administered by me! See here, that sacraments administered by me are genuine. See how the succession runs: Valens, Dolchianus, Narcissus, Dius, Gordias, Narcissus again; Alexander, Mazabanes, Hymenæus, Zambdas,' 'Gurnel, Lendwith, Gornwist, Gorwan, Clendake, Eynyæn, Eludgæth, Elvaoth, Maelschewith,' and so on. Do you understand? 'These are links in the 'succession.' Through links like these, power has come down to Bishop Brownell, Bishop Onderdonk, Bishop McCoskry, and to Bishop Hughes. Through the hands of such a Bishop, the virtue has come down to me. If you have been baptized, and have received the Lord's Supper by my hands, or by the hands of some one like me validly ordained, and no special unbelief or wickedness hinders, you have become indeed and in truth a child of God. But if your minister was not of this succession, no matter how sincerely you may repent and believe the Gospel, the Gospel contains no covenant, or promise, or revealed provision, by which you may be saved. Examine, therefore, your Priest's spiritual pedigree; and as Bishop Hobart says, 'Let it be thy supreme care.'" — pp. 373 — 375.

Mr. Hall may well say, as he does a few pages subsequently, "Do I seem to trifle? The trifling is not mine. I have done no more than to state in plain language, the doctrine of Apostolical succession in its application, — a doctrine which needs only to be stated in plain language, to appear ridiculously absurd."

It has been our purpose to give a general account of their plan and contents, rather than a critical notice of these works. If criticism consist in pointing out faults, the most friendly eye might occasionally find in each something to object to; and in each also there are some statements, inferences, Scriptural interpretations, etc. to which our theology and our ideas of the nature and powers of the Christian Church would lead us to take exception, — to qualify or dissent from them. It is not necessary to our present purpose, however, to dwell upon these points; nor shall we be considered as endorsing every word or sentiment contained in them, in commending these volumes to the study of all those, who would get a general knowledge of the history and principles of Congregationalism, its spirit and tendencies, as compared with those of Prelacy. To this end these books are well adapted, and much needed; for we cannot but think, that upon this subject a degree of ignorance, thoughtlessness and indifference prevails, especially among the young, altogether unsuited to the gravity of the questions at issue and the importance of the interests at stake.

Most of our readers are already so familiar with Dr. Lamson's Convention Sermon as not to need an analysis of its contents. "Father Taylor" says, he likes the Unitarians "because they walk large." This remark was brought to our minds on reading this discourse. Here are large thoughts, broad, expansive, elevating views of the spirit and purpose of the Christian religion, and the modes, the organization, by which it is to be administered, — a brief but comprehensive exposition of "the right, the historical significance and fruits, the spirit and essential tendencies" of Congregationalism, of which we were gratified to hear an Orthodox brother say, within an hour after its delivery, "it is one of the most able, interesting and important sermons preached before the Convention in the last twenty years."

It was our purpose at one time, to have given an extended analysis of Dr. Coit's book, and to have pointed out, with some minuteness, its unfairness, its misrepresentations, and the narrow and ungenerous spirit in which it appears to have been written. But our limits compel us to relinquish this design; and we are well satisfied to do so, because we find the work already done to our hands, in a thorough review of "*A Churchman's Defence*," written by

Hall and published as an appendix to his volume, to which we commend the reader's attention; and also, — because as a history of the period and the subject of which it treats, Dr. Coit's book is too incorrect and unfair, and, as a philosophical discussion of the questions at issue between Prelacy and Puritanism, it is too narrow in its spirit, too weak in its arguments, to demand a serious attempt at refutation. For ourselves, while we object to the principles of High Church Prelacy, whether of Rome or of England, and feel constrained to resist its encroachments, that we may "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free," we trust that we have ever done, and shall ever be disposed to do, justice to the characters of its advocates, both of past and present generations. We admit and believe them to be honest, sincere, conscientious and pious men; and in the devotedness with which they cling to their faith, the zeal with which they advocate it, the efforts and sacrifices they make in its behalf, we recognize attributes of the Christian character, which always command our reverence and admiration, whatever we may think of the cause in which they are displayed. But Dr. Coit, in relation to Puritanism at least, seems incapable of thus separating qualities of character from the cause in devotion to which these qualities are exhibited. His object seems to be, not so much to invalidate the principles of Puritanism as to blacken the character of the Puritans themselves, to impeach their motives and call in question their sincerity and piety. He can see nothing of the lofty religious enthusiasm, the high-souled devotion to truth, the self-sacrificing adherence to principle, the patience, the fortitude, the perseverance, the indomitable Christian energy, that distinguished the character of the Puritans. He can see nothing in them or their deeds to admire, or reverence, or respect; especially not, in the New England Pilgrims. To the question, "Did they abandon England *solely* or even *principally* on account of religious considerations?" his answer is "an immediate negative." The spirit of his book is to represent them as a set of factious persons, who veiled their selfishness and inordinate ambition under the garb of religion, who left England because they could not obtain ascendancy in Church and State, and who, in their retreat from Holland, "never

braved a billow" till they had driven "a favorable bargain with a company of merchants," and obtained a charter rivalling "in their construction of it the powers of Parliament," — declarations as historically false in fact, as they are ungenerous in temper. We acknowledge that, on looking through the pages of Dr. Coit's book a few months since, we were at first disposed to prepare an indignant remonstrance against its unfounded assertions, its misrepresentations, and its unbecoming spirit. But all indignation subsided long before we had finished reading, and we closed the volume with a feeling of pity largely mingled with contempt, — pity for the author's (apparent) utter incapacity to comprehend the meaning, to enter into the spirit of one of the noblest chapters in Christian history, — contempt for his efforts to *make it mean* nothing but obstinacy, or money-making, or squabbles for political power.

As a vindication of the Puritans against the aspersions cast upon them, — the charges of fanaticism, bigotry, intolerance, persecution, — Dr. Hall's book is well deserving of an attentive perusal. From the brief but accurate survey of the facts of their history, presented in his volume, it is clear, that they were no fanatics either in politics or religion, no ambitious disturbers of the public peace, struggling for political pre-eminence, eager to promote discord and commotion, that they might attain power, and impose their own peculiar forms and opinions upon others. The civil war under Charles I. and all the consequences and excesses of that period of strife, were not the product of Puritanism, but the fruit of High Church despotism. It was not the Puritans alone who then opposed the monarch, but the men of all parties, who stood for the liberties of their country against an abject civil and spiritual bondage. These men gathered around the Puritans, as the well known advocates and staunch defenders of freedom, and thus made a party strong enough to overthrow for a time the monarchy and the Church. The Puritans sought not this issue, aimed not to bring it about; but when it came, they were ready to meet it, and to stand in the breach for the liberties of England and the freedom of Christ's disciples. But had the original demands of the Puritans been granted, this issue might have been avoided. "All that we crave," says Dr. Ames, as late as King James's time, in

his "English Puritanism," as quoted by Neal, — "All that we crave of his Majesty and the State is, that, with his and their permission, it may be lawful for us to worship God according to his revealed will; that we may not be *forced* to the observance of any human rites and ceremonies; *so long as it shall please the King and Parliament to maintain the hierarchy or prelacy in this kingdom, we are content that they enjoy their state and dignity*; and we will live as brethren among the ministers that acknowledge spiritual homage to the spiritual lordships, *paying them all temporal duties of tithes*, and joining with them in the service and worship of God, so far as we may without our own particular communicating in those human traditions which we judge unlawful. Only we pray that the prelates and their ecclesiastical officers may not be our judges; but that we may stand at the bar of the civil magistrate; and that if we shall be openly vilified and slandered, it may be lawful for us, without fear of punishment to justify ourselves before the world; and *then we shall think our lives and all we have too little to spend in the service of our king and country.*" Here is modesty, liberality, good sense, patriotism. No enlightened statesman, no American of any political party or any religious denomination, would undertake to maintain that there was anything unreasonable, extravagant or fanatical in these demands. They ask only for the liberty that all enjoy in this land; and let it never be forgotten that this liberty *is* enjoyed here, because the Puritans demanded it in England and *secured it here* by exile and sacrifice.

As to their intolerance, bigotry, persecution, we apprehend that every Churchman, Catholic or Episcopal, should remember the old proverb about "those that live in glass houses" before he heaps upon them these accusations. That the Puritans were superior to all the errors of their times, that they carried out without a single failure the true and lofty conceptions of religious liberty to which they attained and in principle avowed, we by no means claim. We admit that there are stains upon their character and history. But we contend that in the eye of a just and impartial judgment, these stains are like the dark spots upon the sun; they do little to diminish the glory that encircles their memory, the light that streams upon the world from

their example, their principles and their achievements. In weighing the charges brought against the Puritans, these things are to be considered. First, their errors were not their own peculiar, but the common errors of the times. Their intolerance and bigotry were not the result, but the failure, and under the circumstances the not surprising and the pardonable failure, of their principles, whereas the intolerance of the Romanist and the Puseyite Episcopalian is the result of their principles. The principles of the Puritans ultimately led them, and will lead all who embrace them, to a free toleration and an enlarged liberality. The principles of the Romanist and the Puseyite Episcopalian necessarily lead, and have led all who firmly adhere to them, to an intolerant and bigoted administration of religion — to narrow and unworthy conceptions of God's mercy and the Gospel scheme of salvation. Secondly, when thoroughly examined and sifted, many of the instances of persecution charged against the Puritans will be found to be not so much the persecution of religious opinions, as the punishment of disturbances of the public peace, violations of the order and decency and decorum that should reign in every community. It was not for the religious opinions they held, but for the gross, outrageous and indecent acts they committed, that many of the Quakers were punished. Thirdly, a large minority of the magistrates and the people always lamented and opposed these persecutions. Some of the most unhappy measures of religious intolerance to be found in the early annals of the New England colonies, were determined upon and executed by very small majorities; while regret and sorrow filled the hearts and indignant remonstrances broke from the lips of a large minority, who opposed these measures, and were keenly alive to the inconsistency of such measures with the principles and purposes for which they had sought a religious asylum in this Western world. Fourthly, the evil was brief. The principles of the Puritans soon worked themselves clear of the intolerance and bigotry learned in the school of Prelacy. We claim, for the Puritans of New England that which, with a single exception,* we believe

* The Colony of Maryland. It is to be considered, however, that the toleration, established in this colony at its commencement, originated with a single individual, the Proprietary, Lord Baltimore; and was the

ecclesiastical history does not permit to be claimed by any other body of men associated in a political and religious capacity,—namely, the glory of having freely granted a toleration and religious freedom which they had the power to withhold. When Episcopacy first showed itself in an organized form in the New England colonies, and undertook to build churches and sustain ministers, the Puritan Congregationalists were an overwhelming majority. They had an absolute and controlling power in the premises. Theirs was the established religion,—certainly in the Massachusetts and Connecticut colonies. Episcopacy was then “dissent” from the form of religion established and supported by law, as it is now “dissent” from the popular and prevailing forms. Yet in a short time, by the free grant of an overwhelming Congregational majority, Episco-

result, partly of his benevolent disposition and large religious ideas, and in part also, undoubtedly, of a wise commercial policy. He wished to encourage emigration, that the grant of his Sovereign might soon become profitable to himself and his heirs. To every emigrant, therefore, he assigned fifty acres of land in absolute fee, and allowed a general recognition of Christianity under all forms and by all sects; thus securing what was one of his great objects—an asylum for Catholics, and at the same time greatly promoting his own interests, the rapid growth and prosperity of his colony. The “Act concerning religion,” passed by the Assembly of Maryland in 1649, was the result of his wishes and influence, rather than of the principles of the Roman Catholic Church working themselves out in the minds of the people. There is a wide difference, therefore, we conceive, between the case of the Maryland colony and those of New England. The latter had no desire to encourage promiscuous emigration; they would rather have prevented it. They had no large individual Proprietary, whose interests were to be promoted, and whose influence was controlling. Their toleration, therefore, though it came more tardily, with halting steps and many mistakes, was the result of principles gradually developing their influence in the minds of the people. We desire to add, that we have no disposition to detract from the just praise of Catholic toleration in Maryland. It is one of the brightest spots in the history of the Catholic Church, and its overthrow, we may add, one of the darkest in the history of English Episcopacy in America. “The suspension of the proprietary government,” says Grahame, (Vol. ii. p. 56,) “was accompanied with a notable departure from the principles in which its administration was previously conducted. The political equality of religious sects was disallowed, and the toleration that had been extended to every form of Christian worship was abolished. The Church of England was declared to be the established ecclesiastical constitution of the State; and an act passed in the year 1692 having divided the several counties into parishes, a legal maintenance was assigned to a minister of this Communion in any one of these parishes. The appointment of the ministers was vested in the governor, and the management of parochial affairs in vestries elected by the Protestant inhabitants.” Within a few years various prohibitory laws against the Catholics were passed. Here was ingratitude added to persecution.

pallians were exempted from taxation for the support of Congregational worship, and permitted to tax themselves for the maintenance of a minister of the Church of England, to which they conformed. This was done in Connecticut about four years after the first Episcopal society was formed, which was in 1723. It was also done at an early period in Massachusetts; and a like freedom granted to the Quakers, the Baptists, and other sects dissenting from the prevailing Congregationalism; so that long before the Revolution, the Puritan Congregationalists of these colonies had, while an overwhelming majority, and as a legitimate deduction from their principles, imparted and secured to every man within their borders, "the right of an entire freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

To those who charge intolerance and bigotry upon Puritanism, we present this fact, the legitimate result of its principles, and, as compared with Prelacy, the only principles from which it is a legitimate result. Can Prelacy point to a similar fact in its history? Does the Episcopalian find any glory of this sort attaching to the Church of England, which to this hour receives tithes of all Dissenters and bears them down by disabilities as numerous as they are vexatious and oppressive? Nay! does he find it attaching to American Episcopacy, where and so long as it had power? Will not the early religious history of the Episcopal colonies of New York and Virginia make him silent upon the subject of the intolerance and bigotry of New England Congregationalism? Can he find in any of the acts and edicts of the latter aught that savors more of these qualities than some of the acts and edicts of the former? Can he discover in the *fabulous* Blue Laws of Connecticut anything worse than the old law of the Virginia colony, that "every person should go to church on Sundays and Holy Days, or lie neck and heels that night and be a slave to the colony the following week,"—be a slave for a month on the second offence, and for a year and a day on the third? Was not the Virginia law of 1642, forbidding any other than an Episcopal minister to officiate in the colony, more intolerant than anything of the same date to be found in the records of the New England colonies? In describing the condition of this colony in

1688, Grahame says, (Vol. i. p. 140), "The doctrines and rites of the Church of England were established by law; attendance upon divine worship in the parochial churches, and participation in the sacraments of the Church were enjoined under heavy penalties; the preaching of dissenters, and participation in the rites and worship of dissenting congregations, were prohibited, and subjected to various degrees of punishment." These prohibitory laws were never, that we have been able to ascertain, formally repealed, though they were not always rigidly enforced. It is a fact, however, that but little more than thirty years have elapsed since there died in the city of New York a celebrated Presbyterian clergyman, who in the early part of his life was forbidden to preach in Virginia "under penalty of £500, and a year's imprisonment without bail or main-prize;"* so that close up to the time of the Revolution Presbyterianism was under the ban of the law in the Episcopal colony of Virginia. Does American Prelacy appear to greater advantage in the religious history of the Episcopal colony of New York? For nearly a century after their first religious society was organized in New York, the Presbyterians were compelled, in addition to their contributions for the maintenance of their own administration of the Gospel, to pay their quota towards the support of the Episcopal Church, upon which the Government was already lavishing those benefactions that laid the foundations of the present enormous property of Trinity Church. The first Presbyterian house of worship was erected in New York in 1719, partly by contributions received from Connecticut and Scotland. "The direct and strenuous efforts of the vestry of Trinity church defeated their repeated applications for a charter."† So uncertain was the tenure of their property, that for its better security the title was vested in the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. For more than fifty years after the erection of the building, the worshippers, through Episcopal influence and opposition, were refused a charter and deprived of a legal tenure of their property. They never in fact received one from the

* Miller's Life of John Rodgers, quoted by Hall.

† Hall's Puritans and their Principles, p. 404.

colonial government, or from royal grant. In 1774-5, they appealed to the throne with a complaint of their embarrassments, and a petition for a redress of their grievances. A charter was granted in England, but withheld "on this side of the water" by the influence that had hitherto opposed and prevented the grant;* so that up to the very hour of the Revolution, which wrenched the sceptre from its grasp, Prelacy in New York imposed disabilities and embarrassments upon those who did not conform to it. So long as it had the power, it was, not only spiritually and in doctrinal theory, but legally and practically intolerant. How does this compare with Puritan Congregationalism, which for nearly a century previous had granted and secured to every citizen in every colony of New England an entire freedom to worship God according to his conscience?

We have no desire to retort railing for railing, or to make either the Prelatists or the Congregationalists of the present day responsible for the sins of their fathers. But when we find the early history of American Prelacy so completely overlooked, as it often is; when we hear the Puritans reproached, as though the only exhibitions of intolerance and bigotry, the only instances of religious persecution that disgrace the Christian annals of this country, were confined to them, and this too, sometimes by degenerate sons of the Puritans, who owe the very liberty through which they now profess Roman, or English Episcopacy, or whatever else they choose, to the principles and sacrifices of their fathers — we confess to a strong feeling of indignation at the gross injustice done to men, who were large benefactors to mankind, and as noble specimens of the Christian character, in its most lofty and venerable attributes, as the world has ever seen. For ourselves, while we endeavor to cherish the spirit of the Apostle, when he said, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," we yet do glory in being descended from the Puritan Fathers of New England. Next to being a Christian, we glory in being a Congregational Christian. We glory in those great principles upon which the early Congregational churches of New England were planted.

* Hall, p. 405.

We maintain that these principles lead to an enlightened and conservative theology, having its foundation and authority in Scripture, neither exclusive and bigoted on the one hand, nor radical and disorganizing on the other. We maintain that they lead to an elevated, practical, fervent piety, alike removed from the superstitious mummery of the ritualist, from the coldness and formality of the moral philosopher, and from the dreamy mysticism of the transcendentalist.

We believe that these principles, their importance and value, should in every way be urged upon the consideration of the community. The religious aspect of the times indicates the development and constant growth of two opposite tendencies, both of which are suited to mislead the young and unreflecting, and to operate injuriously upon the progress of truth and the religious character of the coming generations. One is the rationalistic tendency, which exalts the soul above the Bible, and holds in slight esteem the facts and foundations of faith as contained in the latter; the other is the hierarchical tendency, which exalts the Church above both the Bible and the soul, and which, while it claims to reverence Scripture, insists that its authority is insufficient, that as a guide to the individual it is inadequate, that the traditions, authority and decisions of the Church are needed in addition, that to them the conscience of the individual must be submitted, and through and from them the individual receive his faith. Congregationalism opposes both these tendencies. Its great idea is that which lies at the bottom of the Protestant Reformation, — the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a guide to faith and practice, with a recognition of the right of private judgment. It receives the Bible as the foundation and guide of faith, — the Bible not as addressed to the Church, but to the individual; its teachings to be interpreted by the individual mind, to be received into the individual heart, to be carried out in the individual life, as the understanding and conscience of the individual may determine. Congregationalism, therefore, neither exalts the soul above the Bible, thus inducing it, in the spirit of a proud and self-relying philosophy, to cry out, "I can do all things of myself," — as though man by his unaided reason could unravel all the mysteries of Providence, of his own being and destiny, and legitimate

a pure and satisfactory religion, one that amidst the perplexities of life and the fearful solemnities of death should give him all that he needs of guidance, strength and peace; nor, on the other hand, does it subject the Bible and the soul to the Church, and thus seal up the former, and induce the latter, in a spirit of slavish subserviency and disregard of its own powers and responsibilities, to say, "I can of myself do nothing; but as the Church, whose office it is to judge and interpret, teaches and decrees, I believe and obey," — as if man as an individual were utterly impotent and ignorant, and the Church, which is but an association of individuals, were omnipotent and infallible. But it holds the Bible and the soul to be, as it were, complements of each other, like the two parts of a cleft rock, which fit into one another, and when united form a harmonious and perfect whole. The soul has wants, and the Bible meets them. The soul asks questions, and the Bible, and that only, authoritatively answers them. Set aside or destroy that authority, and these questions cannot be answered to the soul's satisfaction and peace. The soul has aspirations and hopes, and the Bible confirms and exalts them. Overthrow the Bible, and these hopes have no fixed foundation, no sure resting-place. Congregationalism directs man, not to his own soul as sufficient, not to the Church as the authorized and infallible interpreter of Scripture, but to the Bible as the word of God's revealed will, and to his own soul as the recipient and interpreter of its instructions. It thus avoids both the evil tendencies to which we have alluded, and enables the soul to cry out, "I can do all things," not through myself, not through the Church, but (in the language of the Apostle,) "through Christ strengthening me;" — through the powers and faculties of my own soul, directed and aided by the instructions of the Bible, enlightened and sanctified by the grace and truth that are by Jesus Christ, I can accomplish the great moral purposes of life — can work out my own salvation with fear and trembling.

It is because Congregationalism in its principles, spirit and organization opposes both these tendencies, that we desire to see its friends steadfast in maintaining, zealous in extending it. In this country these tendencies are dangerous, and are both aggravated by circumstances growing out of our political position. The rationalistic tendency finds

an element of success in the independence, the pride of intellect and the self-sufficiency, the want of reverence, the desire to throw off restraint, and to "try something new," which are naturally engendered by our popular institutions, and which can only be checked and counterbalanced by that to which we have not yet attained, the thorough education and enlightenment of the whole people. The universal but limited education of this country, — universal in its privileges, limited in its extent — gives to multitudes just knowledge enough to cause them to wander out of the path, to awaken self-conceit without inspiring humility, to root out from their minds many of the tares of error, but to disturb at the same time the seeds of truth, and to make them disposed to approve a system, which, like the rationalistic, exalts almost without limit the powers of human reason, and flatters the soul with the idea that it is absolute and sufficient in itself, having in its intuitions and prerogatives the source and the criterion of all truth. From the same cause, the hierarchical tendency finds an element of success among those, in whom that love of stability, that desire of something permanent and unchangeable to cleave to, which is inherent in the human mind, has become the controlling influence. This desire finds little or nothing to gratify it — on the contrary, much to baffle and discourage it — in our political institutions. In respect to government, laws, policy, and all civil and social arrangements, we seem to be afloat upon a wide sea of adventure and experiment, ever attempting something new, never admitting or permitting anything to be fixed and permanent. Amid these fluctuations and changes, this uncertainty and instability of every thing around them, many, who have but a weak trust in Providence, and no confidence in humanity, naturally turn to the hierarchical as the most stable, quiet and stationary form of faith. They must have something of this kind to which they can cling, on which they can rest, and they can find it nowhere but in the Church which says, "Thus far and no farther; what was settled and determined by the early fathers and the Councils of olden time is never to be altered." This, we apprehend, is, in part at least, the philosophical explanation to be given of the strong tendency towards Prelacy, which, it must be admitted, has of late years manifested itself in this country.

Both these tendencies are dangerous in this country; the one leading the way to that unbelief, and consequent irreligion and corruption of morals, in which the best interests of society must of necessity find their grave; the other leading to that spiritual despotism, within whose atmosphere civil liberty cannot long breathe. The universal prevalence of this latter tendency in our country would introduce among us just the worst condition of society to be conceived of, namely, the union of a civil democracy with a despotic and arbitrary religious organization. Fortunately the two cannot long subsist together. They who have become submissive tools in their religious capacity, as immortal and accountable beings, are prepared and deserve to become slaves in their civil capacity, as men and as citizens. A Pope, or a hierarchy, infallible or supreme in religious matters by divine right and the grace of Apostolical succession, and a free republic in civil matters, — these are too incongruous things for any long union and harmony between them.

We do not say, for we do not believe, that the Prelatists of the Roman or English school aim at undue power, or that they desire or mean to bring in here the evils and abuses of former times and other countries. But the question to be determined is, not what they desire or mean, but what is the natural tendency of their principles and their system of church polity. That tendency, we contend, is to usurp dominion over thought and conscience, to crush, not develop the individual mind and heart, to produce not a just reverence, but a slavish subjection to the past, to prevent that free action of the individual mind, by which the progress of the community in religious knowledge and its better application to life and character are promoted.

This tendency is checked, and, in the judgment of many, will be completely neutralized, by the influence of our civil institutions, and the growing intelligence and the love of freedom which these institutions foster in the people. Undoubtedly we may hope much from this source. Prelacy is, and long will be, a different thing here, from what it is at Rome or Canterbury. But is it impossible for it to become here what it is there? Is not religion stronger than any other influence that bears upon the community or the individual? Has not the vindication of the rights of conscience

led the way to the recognition of the rights of man? Has not the assertion of religious freedom been the pioneer in the attainment of civil liberty? And may not this process be reversed? May not a free people be subjugated through their religious faith and forms, and civil liberty be lost through spiritual vassalage? And this by a progress so gradual, by steps so imperceptible, that apprehension and struggle come too late, if they come at all? He reads not aright the civil or religious history of mankind, who denies this. Is it well then to rely upon the restraining influence of civil institutions, where the religious influence they are to restrain has proved itself again and again to be the strongest? Is it well to encourage principles and a religious organization, that need to be checked and restrained in order to prevent the disastrous results they would otherwise produce? Is it it not better for every man, in determining the ecclesiastical principles and organization to which he will give his support, to select those which do not need to be checked and restrained, which are simple, free, in harmony with the spirit and forms of our civil institutions, giving scope to the individual pursuit of truth, of easy adaptation to its general progress, and from which nothing unfavorable to the liberties or happiness of mankind need be apprehended? We put this question especially to those "sons of Pilgrim sires," those baptized children of Puritan Congregationalism, who — some of them we fear, thoughtlessly, without due consideration, or the influence of any weighty or sufficient motive — have deserted the faith and organization of their fathers, and become the staunch adherents and zealous advocates of that Prelacy, whose persecutions were the cause of their fathers' exile, sufferings and sacrifices, and which, had there not been this Western world to flee to, would have tolled the knell of expiring liberty in the Church of Christ, and riveted the iron grasp of its power upon the consciences of mankind.

It is this tendency of a religious system and organization, that is especially to be regarded, — the general results it would produce in the course of time, upon coming generations, when carried out, unchecked and unrestrained by counteracting circumstances; and not its particular results in individual instances. We can find good men, devout men, learned, wise, liberal, pious men, true and worthy

disciples of Jesus, under all systems and among all sects from the Catholic to the most ultra-Protestant. This does not prove that it is no matter what men believe, or what ecclesiastical organization prevails among them. One of the heroes of our Revolution was a *Quaker*, till the impulses of an ardent patriotism and the exigencies of his country made him a *General*. This does not prove that Quakerism is warlike and pugnacious; neither does the fact that Washington and Jay were Episcopalians, prove that Prelacy is an inspirer of liberty and the friend of republican institutions, though the argument has been used in one of "the Church" tracts. So Charles Carroll was a Catholic, but this does not establish the liberal spirit and the liberalizing tendency of the Roman hierarchy. Carroll was more of an American than a Catholic, and Washington more of a Christian than an Episcopalian. The tendency of Prelacy is not liberal. The legitimate results of its principles, fully carried out, would not be freedom, truth, progress, the advancement of mankind in religious knowledge and a living faith; but a stationary servitude, a subjection to the forms and the creeds of a dead past. The tendencies of Congregationalism are liberal; the legitimate results of its principles are freedom, truth, progress. It has its element of stability and permanence, not in creeds and canons and ritual, but in the Bible—the word of God; it has its element of progress, in the better understanding, the clearer interpretation of those sacred records. Congregationalism plants itself upon the Bible, the recorded declaration of the Divine will, the recorded evidence of the Divine interposition, the recorded exhibition of the Divine wisdom and goodness and love, the great foundation and source of religious truth; with no rival authority in any man or body of men, in any ecclesiastical or civil rulers, in any traditions from a remote age, which may perchance be correct, or may have originated in fraud or superstition. Here is something that will stand; a principle that cannot be moved; the rock on which Congregationalism builds the Church of Christ. This holy volume Congregationalism opens and offers to all—bids each eye see what it can, each mind gather what it can, each age develop whatever new and noble idea it can find in the immortal page. Congregationalism admits that all the high conceptions, all the lofty

thoughts, all the sublime knowledge on religious subjects, which we are capable of receiving or that word of imparting, may not burst upon us at once, — that truth may be continually breaking from that living, eternal word, in a clearer light, a more beautiful form. Here is its element of progress. It is stable and permanent, for it stands upon the Bible. It is fruitful and progressive, for by the application of reason and thought and meditation, the faithful and humble use of our powers, it bids us gather from the Bible the materials of that structure of divine truth, which faith must erect as the home of our souls, wherein are garnered our best affections and our spirits are educated for the heaven to which our hopes aspire.

We have illustrated one of the great principles of Congregationalism, the basis on which its church members come together. It was our purpose to speak of the other great principle, the independence but mutual sympathy of the separate churches, and say a word on the position and duties of Congregationalists at this present time, particularly in reference to that portion of the Congregational Communion to which we belong. But our limits require that this purpose be deferred to another number. S. K. L.

ART. IX.—DANGERS AND DUTIES OF YOUNG MEN.*

THE volumes named below are all written with one aim, and, while they have their separate styles and dwell upon

* 1. *Lectures to Young Men on their Moral Dangers and Duties.* By Rev. A. A. LIVERMORE. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1846. 18mo. pp. 160.

2. *Duties of Young Men.* By Rev. E. H. CHAPIN. Revised edition. Boston: G. W. Briggs. 1846. 12mo. pp. 267.

3. *Letters to Young Men, founded on the History of Joseph.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Albany. 1845. 12mo. pp. 203.

4. *Counsels addressed to Young Women, Young Men, Young Persons in Married Life, and Young Parents. Delivered in the Second Presbyterian Church, Washington City, on the Evenings of the Sabbaths in April, 1846.* By MATTHEW HALE SMITH. With an Introduction by the Hon. John Quincy Adams. Washington. 1846. 8vo. pp. 116.

5. *Lectures to Young Men on Various Important Subjects.* By HENRY WARD BEECHER, Indianapolis, Indiana. Salem and Cincinnati. 1846. 12mo. pp. 251.

different topics, they are all suited to make a deep impression, and to exert a salutary influence. One fact has particularly impressed us,—that, written as they are by clergymen of various denominations, they are free from cant and have nothing about them of a strictly denominational character. As far as these books are concerned, the writers form one brotherhood. They, for the most part, speak in that manly spirit which may call forth a response in every heart. Is not this among the peculiarities of the times? Religious books are not written in that cold, dry, and technical phraseology, which was their characteristic at a former day. They have more of the freshness and glow of life. They are made to harmonize more fully with good sense and the natural feelings of the heart. We rejoice at this, because we believe that such writings will do vastly more good. They will not be pushed aside with indifference or thrown down in disgust. They have a tone of cheerfulness and truth, which arrests the attention; they have a naturalness and earnestness, which command respect; they have an adaptation, which fastens them upon the memory; they appeal so directly to human experience, that they carry conviction to the heart: and thus we believe they will be far more useful, than the books which were formerly run into a frigid party mould, and sprinkled plentifully with familiar texts of Scripture; which enforced the dogmas of particular sects; and which had as little, apparently, to do with real life and the heart's best affections, as the mountains of Norway with the mildness and beauty of spring.

Another reason why we rejoice to see such books coming from the midst of different denominations is, that it shows a growing conviction of the noble and expansive character of Christianity. The religion of Jesus cannot be bound down to the technicalities of party. When it would address the intellect of the country, it must speak in a free and natural manner. The very thought of bringing religion before our young men seems to liberate the spirit. A higher and a manlier tone is heard, and we behold the truth stated in such a manner that enlightened reason can weigh it, and accept it with joy. This age needs such an expression of religious truth. A skepticism and an immorality are abroad, which make it imperative upon every

friend of God and humanity to do the utmost that may be in his power. And if society is to be renovated, it must be, in part, by calling forth purer affections and higher motives among our young men; and if our young men are to be reached, it must be by a rational and earnest appeal. Christianity must come forth in her divine beauty, and speak in a clear and cheerful tone; she must walk with a firm foot over the earth, and show how closely her principles are connected with the practical details of daily life and the highest well-being of man.

Each of the books we have named can be recommended, as free at least from everything narrow and sectarian. They each pass through a wide circle of topics, and, generally, with a large and generous spirit. The contents of Mr. Livermore's book was first given as Sunday evening Lectures, at the request of the young men of Keene, and the volume is marked somewhat, as the writer states in his preface, by "circumstances of time and place, and local wants and views." Still it dwells upon those moral exposures and obligations of early manhood which are more or less common to all, and will, no doubt, be found both interesting and profitable to a far wider circle than that for which it was first prepared. The Lectures are written with such honest frankness that the reader can never be at a loss to understand the meaning. Not satisfied with commonplace generalities, the writer seizes upon the actual evils of the present day, and goes into such an exact statement that one must consider with self-application, and feel the full force of every statement made. The pages are not covered with showy declamation or dazzling figures of rhetoric, but are evidently written to be useful, and are therefore simple and direct. Yet they are by no means deficient either in force or beauty, and have, not unfrequently, and without any false striving for effect, a genuine originality of expression.

We will give a few brief passages which may serve as illustrations of the general style. In speaking of the dizzy round of corrupting pleasures, he says:—

"The world is not so barren of beauty and of bliss, that we must, to recreate our spirits, drink of the foul sediment of corrupt pleasure. When every sunbeam is winged with glory, and every snow-flake drops down as if it were a benediction

from the skies; when, in our daily walks, so much of gladness meets us at every turn; when, even in our labors of hand and head, there is often mingled so much of still, steady happiness; when, in our homes, the air is so full of love and enjoyment; when, in music, in books, in innocent sports and games, in the walk, the ride, the social festivity, such ample and various means are provided for all reasonable exhilaration, who would, in his better moments, wish to plunge into the giddy whirl of fashionable dissipation?" — p. 50.

As a specimen of the directness with which portions are written, we give the following: —

"A young man cannot learn too early, that the easy swagger, the flippant speech, the ready oath, the cigar puffed in the face of the town, the glass tossed off among admiring associates, are no marks of real dignity, but that they lower him in the respect of others, as much as they do in fact in his own." — p. 81.

In speaking of profaneness he says: —

"Such a custom is no mark of a gentleman, any more than it is of a Christian. It is as far from good manners as it is from good morals. It brands a man at once, in the eyes of all good judges, as low-bred and vulgar, though he may wear broad-cloth and gold. The first profane lisp reveals his want of true politeness as much as of correct principle." — p. 25.

Among the examples of plain speaking, we would refer to the chapter on the pernicious effects of the use of tobacco, which both laymen and clergymen would do well to consider. The testimony of such men as Rush, Franklin, Boerhaave, Woodward, Darwin, Chapman, and many others, is given. The following is the testimony of John Quincy Adams. This venerable statesman in a recent letter says, that in early life he used tobacco, but for more than thirty years he has discontinued the practice.

"I have often wished," says he, "that every individual of the human race, affected with this artificial passion, would prevail upon himself to try, but for three months, the experiment which I have made, and am sure that it would turn every acre of tobacco land into a wheat field, and add five years to the average of human life." — p. 60.

Mr. Livermore thus goes faithfully through the list of moral dangers and duties upon which young men may be profitably advised, and gives plain counsels to which we trust many will listen.

Mr. Chapin's book is more particularly upon the *duties* of young men, which he considers under the head of "social duties," "duties as citizens," "intellectual duties," and "moral duties." This is a revised edition, and the author states that the style of the first edition was florid and redundant, and that he would gladly have broken up the very mould and recast the whole work, and thus have given us more mature thought in a more sober style. After such a statement by the writer himself, criticism is disarmed. The volume is full of excellent suggestions, the general arrangement is good, and the spirit of the book is pure and elevating. It holds up a high standard, and is evidently written by one who feels all that he says. As a specimen of the work we extract the following: —

"Do not underrate your influence, or idly suppose that you have no influence at all. The mass is made up of individuals. You are one of that mass. *Your* acts, *your* thoughts, *your* words, help create that diffusive leaven which forms its character, and is called public sentiment. But if you have influence upon one individual only, that fact is enough to make it your solemn and binding duty to see to it that your influence is pure and correct, — that not a particle of the evil which may come upon society, shall proceed directly or indirectly from you. Talk not to me, then, of insignificance and limited influence. When I behold deep-flowing rivers, made up of drops that have fallen, one by one, away back among the mountains and in the narrow recesses of the rock; when I see broad and lofty forests that have arisen from little seeds which the birds of the air have scattered and the hunter has trampled into the soil; when I see the avalanche that started from the summit a little mass that a child could have turned aside, thundering on and sweeping all before it; — when I see results like these, I say, I am incredulous as to the inefficacy of small and obscure causes." — p. 62.

"There is no man that lives in society whose influence is entirely negative, or who has no influence at all. Let us not mistake ourselves. Let us not form the idea that we are more insignificant than we really are." — p. 60.

Dr. Sprague's book is written in the form of letters, and is founded on the history of Joseph. It commences with an outline of this Scripture history, and then divides itself into three parts, — "sources of danger to young men," "character to which young men should aspire," and "the rewards that crown a virtuous course." The whole

is written in a clear, simple manner, and is pervaded by sound reason and good sense. There is no exaggeration of statement, but all is calm and dispassionate. They are such letters as a father might write to his son. There is little excitement for the imagination, but much wholesome counsel for the judgment. The style is sober and dignified, and yet natural; it may perhaps be the more useful for not being overwrought. The views of the author in undertaking the work are thus stated in the first letter:—

“The growing conviction which I have had for years of the importance of those interests which are soon to be devolved upon the young men of the present generation, has, at different times, brought me almost to the determination of addressing to them a short series of letters, designed to impress them with a sense of their obligations, and to aid in the general formation of their character. I have, however, been deterred from executing, or even forming, a definite purpose on this subject, by the consideration that many wise and excellent men have already written books of counsel to the young, to which they can readily gain access; and that any attempt which I might make, would result in nothing better than a repetition of things which had often been more attractively and more impressively said before. It occurred to me, however, lately, as I was reading the touching and beautiful story of Joseph, that there is much in it that deserves the most attentive consideration, especially of every young man; and in this thought originated the purpose, which I have now set myself to execute, of endeavoring to render this scripture narrative subservient to the best interests of the young men of the present day. Still, my young friends, I have no expectation of offering anything to your consideration that is substantially new: the utmost that I can hope is, that I may give increasing effect to the counsels which I shall suggest, by incorporating them with a story, which, in respect to the interest of its incidents and the beauty of its descriptions, is universally acknowledged to be unrivalled even in the sacred Scriptures.”
—p. 30.

These Letters by Dr. Sprague we would cheerfully recommend as containing most excellent suggestions both for old and young.

The only thing remarkable about the slight volume by Mr. Smith is, that it has an “Introduction” by President Adams. This is in fact a brief letter of twenty lines, addressed to Mr. Smith, which he has here blazoned forth so as to give the impression that it is an “Introduc-

tion"! This will answer the purpose of procuring a sale for the book, which it could not have gained by any merit of its own. These sermons, in many respects, will not compare with those written in the general course of ministerial duty. And yet the writer ostentatiously tells us that they were delivered before the most "distinguished" persons. They are upon common-place topics, which have been a thousand times treated; yet the writer states that "he has not been able to obtain help on these subjects, and has been compelled in a great measure to open the path in which he has travelled."!

He is specially severe upon dancing. As a specimen of his liberality in this respect, he exclaims, "Dancing is open to such objection that no female can, with propriety, engage in it. It has always done mischief, from the day John the Baptist by it lost his head, to the present hour." Dwelling in the midst of slavery, where the clank of the chain is heard even at the door of the capitol, he says not one word upon that monstrous wrong. Delivering these Lectures at Washington while the country was commencing an unjust and iniquitous war,—this he considered too small an evil to be noticed. But dancing calls forth his indignant reproof. He very solemnly gives the following statement upon this head:—

"Let me illustrate: A young lady, of great personal beauty and very accomplished, was at a fashionable watering-place during the summer. A gentleman, now one high in the service of the United States, was attracted by her appearance and accomplishments, and invited her to join him in the dance. She very politely, but positively, declined. He repeated the request soon after, and again she declined. He very civilly asked the reason. 'Sir,' said she, 'I am a Christian.'" — p. 35.

To show the character of the illustrations which he brings before his "intelligent and crowded auditories," we quote the following:—

"A young woman of great personal beauty had an indulgent parent. No expense had been spared to place at her disposal whatever accomplishment she chose. Her mind only was deformed; her temper was tart; her spirit uncontrolled; though no one took more pains than herself to induce all to believe that she was the most amiable of her sex. Sitting by herself one day in the library, she felt a hand laid lightly upon her shoulder.

Presuming that it was her father, she exclaimed, 'Go away, you old plague; I wish you would let me alone!' As she looked up, she saw the face of a gentleman whose good opinion she was anxious to secure. Blushing deeply, she exclaimed, 'Pray excuse my rudeness, sir; I thought it was pa!'" — p. 13.

He states the following in such a manner that few, probably, would have the hardihood to deny its truth: —

"The wife, who appears in the presence of her husband, or at his table, in a slatternly dress — with hair uncombed, half-washed, and slip-shod — and does so on the ground that no one is to be present but her husband, gives occasion for less regard."

He even ventures to add; "It would not be marvellous if his opinion of her taste, tenderness and affection, should be somewhat modified or reduced." — p. 77.

In his counsels to young men he briefly sums up the following rules: —

"Make your toilet for the day; then commend yourself to God by prayer and the reading of his word. Go early to church. Lounge not around the door, nor stand in the passage, nor upon the steps. You would not do so at the house of a gentleman; you should not do so at the house of God. Never wear your hat in the house of God; you would not do so in the presence of ladies." — p. 59.

As an example of the manner in which he at times works up a passage and brings it to a powerful climax, take this.

"The fame of Rogers makes us feel certain that any cutlery that bears his name is what it professes to be. The same is true of the compass of one European house, or the telescope of another. Be not a genius. Select some one pursuit, and then follow it diligently — pursue it with all your soul. Be the best of your class; if you are a boot-black, be the best one in the country." — p. 46.

Though passages of a similar character abound through the book, yet its counsels generally, well-followed, would do good. As for the ability of the work, intellectually considered, it cannot be said to rank above mediocrity. It has constant repetition, and is often marked by flippancy and conceit.

We wish that Mr. Adams could himself be induced to publish a series of letters to the young men of America. Who could do it so eloquently? Whose words would command such profound respect?

The volume by Henry Ward Beecher is full of spirit and fire. Its sketches are as graphic as life; they are dashed off with a masterly freedom. Byron, in his famous line upon the poet Crabbe, calls him

“Nature’s sternest painter, yet the best;”

And Beecher is in prose what Crabbe was in poetry. He works with his pen, as Retzsch does with his pencil. His thoughts blaze up like rockets. His rebukes strike like cannon-balls. There is no escaping him. His chapters are headed as follows:—“Industry and idleness.” “Twelve causes of dishonesty.” “Six warnings.” “The portrait gallery.” “Gamblers and gambling.” “The strange woman.” “Popular amusements.” Under these heads the writer goes to his subject with the utmost fearlessness. There is no circumlocution, no paring away. If good old Saxon words can speak the thought, it is spoken; and if any one wishes to see what Saxon words *can* say, he may find it here. Fearful as are his pictures of mature depravity, the following will show his feelings in regard to childhood:—

“The heart of youth is a wide prairie. Over it hang the clouds of heaven to water it, the sun throws its broad sheets of light upon it, to wake its life; out of its bosom spring, the long season through, flowers of a hundred names and hues, twining together their lovely forms, wafting to each other a grateful odor and nodding each to each in the summer-breeze. Oh! such would man be, did he hold that purity of heart which God gave him.”—p. 213.

But he dwells not upon generalities. He seizes upon the sins of society. His account of gambling, as practised in the Western States, is boldly given, and the evils are drawn with terrible vivacity. In reference to the libertine, and the poor creatures who are the victims of his iniquity, we subjoin this sketch.

“Look out upon that fallen creature whose gay sally through the streets calls out the significant laugh of bad men, the pity of good men, and the horror of the pure. Was not her cradle as pure as ever a loved infant pressed? Love soothed its cries. Sisters watched its peaceful sleep, and a mother pressed it fondly to her bosom! Had you afterwards, when spring-flowers covered the earth, and every gale was odor and every sound was music, seen her, fairer than the lily or the violet, searching

them, would you not have said, 'sooner shall the rose grow poisonous than she; both may wither, but neither corrupt'? And how often, at evening, did she clasp her tiny hands in prayer? How often did she put the wonder-raising questions to her mother, of God, and heaven, and the dead, — as if she had seen heavenly things in a vision! As young womanhood advanced, and these foreshadowed graces ripened to the bud and burst into bloom, health glowed in her cheek, love looked from her eye, and purity was an atmosphere around her. Alas! she forsook the guide of her youth. Faint thoughts of evil, like a far-off cloud which the sunset gilds, came first; nor does the rosy sunset blush deeper along the heaven, than her cheek, at the first thought of evil. Now, ah! mother, and thou guiding elder sister, could you have seen the lurking spirit embosomed in that cloud, a holy prayer might have broken the spell, a tear have washed its stain! Alas! they saw it not; she spoke it not; she was forsaking 'the guide of her youth.' She thinketh no more of heaven. She breatheth no more prayers. She hath no more penitential tears to shed; until, after a long life, she drops the bitter tear upon the cheek of despair, — then her only suitor. 'Thou hast forsaken the covenant of thy God.' Go down! fall never to rise! Hell opens to be thy home!

Oh Prince of torment! if thou hast transforming power, give some relief to this once innocent child, whom another has corrupted! Let thy deepest damnation seize him who brought her hither! Let his coronation be upon the very mount of torment! and the rain of fiery hail be his salutation! He shall be crowned with thorns poisoned and anguish-bearing; and every woe beat upon him, and every wave of hell roll over the first risings of baffled hope. Thy guilty thoughts, and guilty deeds, shall flit after thee with bows which never break, and quivers forever emptying but never exhausted! If Satan hath one dart more poisoned than another; if there be one hideous spirit more unrelenting than others; they shall be *thine*, most execrable wretch! who led her to 'forsake the guide of her youth and to abandon the covenant of her God.' — pp. 186, 187.

There are multitudes in our land who might well feel smitten by such a passage as this; for conscience would whisper to their hearts, telling them of their own guilt, and making them feel that if there is one sin more than another which is the source of most hideous woe, it is this. How many a fair spirit has been thus polluted! And how wide-spread are the monstrous abominations connected with this wickedness! Could the curtain be uplifted which conceals this vice, how many would start back in amazement, how many would be overwhelmed with anguish.

As another specimen of Mr. Beecher's style, we open his Lectures at random, and take the following:—

"I may here, as well as anywhere, impart the secret of *good* and *bad* luck. There are men, who supposing Providence to have an implacable spite against them, bemoan in the poverty of a wretched old age the misfortunes of their lives. Luck forever ran against them, and for others. One, with a good profession, lost his luck in the river, where he idled away his time a fishing, when he should have been in the office. Another, with a good trade, perpetually burnt up his luck by his hot temper, which provoked his employers to leave him. Another, with a lucrative business, lost his luck by amazing diligence at everything but his business. Another, who steadily followed his trade, as steadily followed his bottle. Another, who was honest and constant to his work, erred by perpetual misjudgments;—he lacked discretion. Hundreds lose their luck by endorsing; by sanguine speculations; by trusting fraudulent men; and by dishonest gains. A man never has good luck who has a bad wife. I never knew an early-rising, hard-working, prudent man, careful of his earnings and strictly honest, who complained of bad luck. A good character, good habits and iron industry, are impregnable to the assaults of all the ill luck that fools ever dreamed of. But when I see a tatterdemalion, creeping out of a grocery late in the forenoon, with his hands stuck into his pockets, the rim of his hat turned up, and the crown knocked in, I know he has had bad luck,—for the worst of all luck, is to be a sluggard, a knave, or a tippler."—p. 30.

In the chapter entitled, "the Portrait Gallery," are descriptions of the wit, the humorist, the cynic, the politician, and the demagogue. So also we are taken to the house of evil, where we see five wards,—pleasure, satiety, discovery, disease, and death. Under all these heads are passages, which can hardly be perused without leaving a deep impression upon the mind. There are sentences in the volume, which might be considered by some persons to be in bad taste, but the writer has evidently sought to speak truly and not fritter away the meaning by the use of inadequate terms. He holds his pen with a steady hand and writes with honest fidelity. If his style is deficient in repose, it lacks not energy, and it has a life and spirit which arrest the attention and hurry one along, as by a spell, through its earnest appeals, and sharp delineations, and graphic picturings. We doubt not this volume has already done much good and is destined to do much more.

We have now noticed five books which have been recently published, all of which are addressed to young men. This may seem at first a greater number than can be needed, but when we think of the multitude who are coming forward upon the active stage of life, when we remember the temptations and trials which await them, when also we call to mind the incalculable importance, both to themselves and others, of their having right views and principles, we should rejoice that so many stand ready to give worthy counsel. And never, never was there more urgent occasion for doing all that is possible to awaken the young men of our land to a high sense of duty. If we consider our country in connexion with its rapid growth and increasing prosperity, we shall see the necessity of right principles. If we look upon our country in its present position, and notice the selfish and wicked passions which are at work; if we remember how willing our Government has been to plunge itself into the atrocities of war, calling for millions of money to carry on the work of carnage, and sending forth invitations to all sections of the Union to aid in the monstrous iniquity; if we see how indifferent the public mind is to this evil, and how the spirit of war seems still to rule in the human heart,—we must become in some measure sensible to the low state of public sentiment in regard to the first principles of Christianity. Ponder the detestable opinions which prevail in regard to military affairs. How few speak as if war was opposed to the direct injunctions of the Gospel. Who believes in the principles of Christian forbearance and love? How popular are military parades, and how ready is the imagination to be dazzled by the glitter of a showy costume, and utterly fascinated and carried away by the gaudy trappings of war! There is an antichristian spirit still active in the public mind, something quite at variance with the mild, loving, forbearing spirit of Jesus. In order to rectify this, we need the strength of our young men. They must come with a manly courage to the rescue of Christian principles. They should feel that the spirit of war is the spirit of Heathenism, and be willing to take a high and honorable stand. There needs to be a wide-spread revolution upon this subject, and Christianity can never exert its due influence until this be effected.

When we look at another evil in our land, with its many abominations, and see how it is extending its fearful influence, we feel that the public mind should be strengthened and enlightened by Christian principle. The enormities of slavery are bringing this country to a crisis. Before the present generation shall have passed away, momentous changes must take place. Who will deny, that in reference to this it is of the utmost importance to have right views fixed in the minds of the young men of America? Upon their fidelity the future destinies of this land must in a great measure depend.

There is yet another evil, which is increasing, and which demands attention. It may be a difficult thing upon which to speak or to act, but who can consider it and not feel that something should be done? The vice of licentiousness is one upon which many persons feel that they should be dumb; and yet society by it is corrupted, and the festering evil is eating away the very heart of our land. The statistics upon this subject are alarming. Those who have investigated the real condition of things, state that the extent of this vice is almost beyond conception, and is increasing. What shall be done? Can we stand idle? Are infamous houses to remain thickly scattered through our cities? Shall our young men be left to sink deeper and deeper into this horrible iniquity? Is nothing judicious except silence? And is there wisdom in nothing save utter inaction? We are sensible of the difficulties surrounding this subject, but we ask for it thought. Certainly our young men, the vigor and strength of our land, may be spoken to. How many among them would stand aghast at this evil, and be willing to exert themselves to the utmost to remove it.

There are other subjects upon which we might dwell, but we have already occupied more space than we intended. We would, in bringing these remarks to a close, call upon young men to devote themselves to every work of good, — to be decided in their allegiance to virtue, — to feel that in every walk of life they may be the fearless advocates of right, and the faithful and uncompromising witnesses of truth. There is no one so void of influence as not to be able to accomplish something. His daily life, his consistent conduct, his earnest speech will not be without their effect.

We would add one word on another point. If there be those who are now engaged in study and who are doubtful to what profession they shall dedicate their powers, we would ask them to consider well the Christian ministry. We need here more, earnest, faithful minds. There is a vast work to be accomplished. And there is no labor more delightful and satisfactory to a true spirit. The diffusion of truth and the redemption of man may well inspire the loftiest powers, and give new energy to a soul desirous of not living wholly in vain. It is also an interesting thought, that all the studies and duties connected with the labors of a minister of the Gospel are of an elevating nature. No one will doubt the truth of a remark by Dr. Arnold, recorded in Stanley's interesting memoir of him. In speaking of the Christian minister, he says, — "The very studies which would most tend to make him a good and wise man, do therefore of necessity tend to make him a good clergyman." And Coleridge in his "*Biographia Literaria*" says, "The Church presents to every man of learning and genius a profession, in which he may cherish a rational hope of being able to unite the widest schemes of literary utility with the strictest performance of professional duties." In addition to this, we might speak of the peculiar opportunities which the minister constantly enjoys of accomplishing good. We trust that many of our young men of promise and of power will be ready to consecrate themselves to the cause of the Gospel.

But all men may be ministers in their separate spheres. They may, by their fidelity and general excellence, exemplify the principles of justice and truth. And certainly if ever there was a period in the history of the world when every man should be faithful to duty, this is the time.

R. C. W.

ART. X.—JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

"BLESSED are the pure in heart; for they shall see God." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born

of the Spirit is spirit." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me."—These words of Jesus express with clearness the essence of what he taught concerning justification by faith,—the doctrine which tells us, that vital holiness nourished in the stillness of a convinced heart, and revealed in thoughts and deeds of universal love, renders man acceptable as the child of God. The sermon on the Mount contains a few general applications of this principle, which is comprehensively stated in the simple and beautiful formula:—"Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

Christianity, like every purely religious system, takes for granted three facts;—a world in need of regeneration; a consciousness, in the world, of this need; and a spiritual nature in man, which, degraded as it may now be, has in itself, of its own free will and energy, the capacity of receiving and appropriating all the influences which the system can bring to bear upon it. A religion that does not assume these three facts, is wanting in a definite object to be accomplished, in the means by which alone such an object can be accomplished, or in both.

At the time when Jesus Christ appeared, the soul of the human race had passed through many centuries of sin. By constant practice of iniquity its vision had become dimmed, its original energy weakened. The need of a Redeemer is demonstrated by the history of that darkest of all ages, the age preceding Christ. Humanity could not rise unaided; for all its life was derived from a polluted world, that was itself panting for the quickening breath of God. On whatever theory we may explain this degradation in man, it was in view of its actual existence that Christ, the Redeemer, was sent to infuse a new, divine spirit into the race, that it might be restored to its Father. This Redeemer men must acknowledge; for through him alone is the way to God opened, by him alone is the divine life transmitted. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." But belief, however necessary, is not faith; but rather the instrument used by faith, the ladder upon which the angels of God descend upon the slumbering spirit: while faith is the inward power by which the spirit, roused to action by various motives, draws within itself the influences that come from

God through Christ, — through his teachings and sufferings, his holy life and death; the influences which quicken the higher nature, redeem and sanctify the whole character of man.

The necessity that the inward holiness thus acquired should express itself in deeds of outward beneficence, shows us the relation between this doctrine of justification, and those other words of Jesus, — “They that have done good shall inherit the resurrection of life.” We are thus led naturally to the true doctrine of justification by faith. Man, conscious of his alienation from God, by a powerful effort of faith, which, based upon belief, demands supernatural aid, fixes his trust on Christ as the commissioned of the Father, the only Redeemer and spiritual Regenerator of humanity. This brief analysis brings us back to the living formula of Jesus, — “Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.”

Having touched upon the leading points in our Saviour's teachings, let us now trace the same doctrine through a different line of development. The truth which Jesus the Christ uttered with little method or logical arrangement, Paul the Apostle analyzed and proved. The Apostle to the Gentiles, reasoning chiefly against Jews, explained his fundamental principle upon the Jewish ground. “Law” and “righteousness” are, therefore, the central terms from which our exposition of his system must proceed. The word “righteousness,” in the Jewish sense, denoted that peculiar state of thought, feeling and spiritual culture, which theocratic institutions would naturally produce. And “law” denoted that externally prescribed rule of action, whether ritual or moral, by obeying which a Jew became righteous. Paul employs the word to express the essential spirit of Judaism, a system which presented religion as something outward and preceptive, instead of something inward and spontaneous. This view Paul, as a Jew and a Pharisee, held until his conversion, after which time he mightily set forth the doctrine, that the new birth was from within, outward, not from without, inward. For law, the outward command, he substituted faith, the inward principle, and consequently gave a more spiritual meaning to “righteousness” and “justification.” The Jewish idea was inconsistent with itself, and false, as Paul says in his

Epistle to the Galatians. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily, righteousness should have been by the law." If any outward command could impart the internal life of the heart, from which all goodness must spontaneously proceed, then it would be reasonable to talk of righteousness proceeding from obedience to law. Yet even then, the righteousness would not be wrought by the law, for the external presupposes the internal. There can be no true obedience except it spring from the inward spiritual life, which lies behind all law.

Paul by no means disparages the law in its proper sphere, as written on the hearts of Gentiles or in the books of Jews. On the contrary, he calls it "holy" and "good." He only denies that men can obey it without having spiritual life. To explain this, we must penetrate a little deeper into his doctrine, commencing with man's need of redemption. This need, which Jesus silently presupposed, Paul attempts to account for by the old Hebrew tradition of Adam. He draws the parallel between Adam and Christ; the death-bringer, and the life-bringer. As by one sin, and the consequent growth and supremacy of the sinful tendency, humanity was driven down into death; so, by one holy life, and the consequent renewal of the spiritual tendency, it was raised from the dead. Adam had broken the union between man and God; he had relied upon himself. Man's lower nature was thus strengthened against the higher. By the law that regulates the propagation of races, evil produced evil, and sin ever darkened godliness as mankind grew up. The spiritual energy of the race and the motives to its exertion constantly lost power as the force of evil desires accumulated, and the occasional desperate reactions of an individual or a generation were too feeble to resist the pressure of sin. The evil seed planted by Adam grew into a deadly tree, which darkened the earth; humanity was freezing under its shade.

But Paul nowhere says that human nature is essentially depraved; or that any particular man is unavoidably sinful, except in the sense that he who is born into a world grown old in iniquity, can scarcely escape taint. The tendencies and impulses of the whole race had been corrupted and perverted by the increasing supremacy of the sinful principle, but not so that the original nature of man, as the

offspring of God and created in his image, had been destroyed. This idea of natural depravity he contradicts often enough. The assertion of it would reduce to an utter absurdity and mockery his, and any other religious system. His whole doctrine hangs upon the assumption, that man's nature is essentially the same divine creation that first came from the hand of God. Even in the frightful corruption he describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, he presupposes an undeniable and partially illuminating knowledge of God in human nature, which may be wholly restored, and has been so restored by Christ.

In accordance with this general view of Adam's sin, the work of the life-bringing Redeemer Paul considers as two-fold,—upon humanity, and upon each individual:—the first wrought by God, objectively upon the race, through Christ; the second wrought by man, subjectively upon himself, through faith in Christ. The entire work was accomplished by the life, truth, spirit and devoted suffering of Jesus, and by his death as the crowning suffering and act of consecration of his life. He checked the progress of the evil principle which had alienated the whole race from God; introduced a new current of life, and restored men to a condition in which they could exert faith and return to their Father. This first work, which was wrought ideally, was performed independently of any effort on the part of man.

Upon this universal foundation each individual must build up his own salvation. In this connexion Paul introduces the word, faith. Faith, as contrasted with law, is the ruling, fundamental principle of the Christian character. It supposes a supernatural revelation, and belief in him by whom it was brought. The need of this belief Paul insists upon constantly, sometimes under various forms of allegory. Faith supposes also a consciousness of sin. This Paul assumes as a universal fact, and in support of it he adduces his own spiritual experience, and appeals to that of others. By faith the soul draws into itself a new principle of life, which is constantly penetrating and transforming the old nature. By faith the spirit of the Christian is bound to Christ's; filled with his deep peace; nerved by his strengthening power; illuminated and blessed with his love. Carrying out with fervid logic this glorious thought, Paul

saw the mystical union with Christ ideally completed in every Christian, when he exclaimed, "How shall we who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" It is an utter, vile contradiction, to say that the Christian, the man who has bound himself to Christ by the ties of a living faith, can be tampering with the devil at the same time. "What communion hath light with darkness?" "What concord hath Christ with Belial?"

Thus, according to Paul, man is justified by faith in Christ, and enjoys once more the harmony which Adam had broken. And thus, through the rapid, laboring utterances of the Apostle, we may trace the quiet words of Jesus, "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God." Paul has adopted the formula of Christ; analyzed it; connected it with the ancient tradition; illustrated it by the Jewish patriarchs and by his own sacred experience, and rendered it back to us sanctified and precious as ever.

It has been always a question, whether James does not contradict or undervalue this doctrine of faith. Before attempting therefore to reconcile completely Paul's doctrine of faith with James's doctrine of works, it must be observed, that Paul nowhere in his writings undervalues those good works that result from a genuine faith. Neither does James cast any reproach upon the living faith of the heart, as passages in his Epistle will testify. On the contrary, he is insisting upon the constant manifestation of that very faith.

Paul, unfolding the essential principle of all religion, uses the word "faith" in its highest sense, to denote the living power, by which the free spirit appropriates the divine life. James, whose real doctrine was precisely the same with Paul's, but who was arguing against men who had lost sight of the essential principle of religion, uses the word sometimes in their sense of belief, which is the instrument of faith. In the view of Paul, works of love have no merit apart from the faith that suggests them. A man is accepted according to what he is, not according to what he does. In the view of James, works of love, although in themselves useless, do nevertheless presuppose living faith, without which they could not exist. So that "works" must be insisted upon as the only evidence of faith. "Show me thy faith without thy works (if thou canst;) and I will show thee my faith by my works."

The only difference between Paul and James, beyond a mere difference in statement, lies in this. Paul would say, "faith necessarily gives birth to works of love, but all that seem to us works of love do not of necessity presuppose faith." James would say, "faith necessarily gives birth to works of love, and works of love do of necessity presuppose faith." Both maintain that a man is accepted according to what he is, not according to what he does; but James holds, that what a man does is a fair index of what he is.

In their general reasoning, Paul is contending for the living cause, the devoted heart, in contrast with a bald, outward observance of rules and proprieties. James is contending for the effects, the deeds of mercy, the necessary results of a living cause, in contrast with a barren belief which took the name of faith without any of its reality. To these two points of view the writers were led partly by difference in temperament and outward circumstances, and partly by the different development of their Christian life. James was not reasoning against the misunderstanding or the abuse of Paul's doctrine, much less against the doctrine itself. He was fixing the mark of infidelity upon the practical heathenism and shallow belief of his generation.

Christ, Paul, James, — the divinely commissioned Bearer, the profound theologian, the practical moralist, of Christianity. Christ teaches the free, spontaneous growth of the Christian life, inward and outward, from the inward to the outward, as effect and cause imply each other. Paul teaches the supreme worth of the inward cause, without which there can be no effect. James teaches the absolute necessity of the effect, without which there can be no cause. Each of these Apostles analyzes one side of the doctrine more particularly, while both find their centre and full meaning in Christ. And once again we hear the simple, grand formula of Jesus, — "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

Justification by faith, — the great Christian doctrine of religious progress and spiritual liberty, — it tells us that through the coil and fret of life the soul can see its God, can approach him by high resolve and steady endeavor. And yet, this doctrine, which lies at the very foundation of our religion, has been misapprehended and cried down by all prominent parties among Christians, in every age. The

Romanist, by making faith supernatural and subordinate to charity, which was also a supernatural quality, by defining it as mere assent to God's truth, destroyed its vitality; made that which is free from all restraint of men a mere appendage to his own ritual service; buried it under the shrine of the Virgin. The great reformer, employing a word which he did not define, and wrapping his doctrine in the dark metaphysics of Augustine, preached a "justification by faith," which, powerful as it was against Romanism when it rolled out from the impetuous heart of Luther, became barren and inconsistent in the formulas of his disciples. And now, a few men in the mother-land and in New England, but lately contending with their foes for an existence, and even at this moment contending among themselves for a title, men just peering out of their strong-hold to measure the field around them, constitute the only body in Christendom that understands and preaches this doctrine of Christ. God grant, that this body, welded together in the faith and love of that Christ, may carry abroad his doctrine of life, with kindly and patient hearts, with frank and fearless spirits; never faltering before wrong, never cringing before arrogance, until the spirit of Jesus the Redeemer shall have regenerated mankind. O. B. F.

ART. XI.—YOUNG'S CHRONICLES.*

WE think Mr. Young has done a good work, for which he is well fitted by his taste and acquirements, in presenting to the lovers of our early history this collection of documents, penned originally by those who drew the furrows and scattered the seed of our noble Commonwealth here in the wilderness. The book throughout affords ample proof of the hearty love of his subject, which prompted the editor to his task; as the notes give evidence of the learning, with which he has illustrated the several topics which are included in the range of his plan.

* *Chronicles of the first Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, from 1623 to 1636. Now first collected from original records and contemporaneous manuscripts, and illustrated with Notes.* By ALEXANDER YOUNG. Boston: Little & Brown. 1846. 8vo. pp. 571.

The volume, which bears on its front a good engraving from Vandyke's portrait of Governor Winthrop, with a countenance and garb indicating gentle breeding, consists of twenty-four different documents, which Mr. Young has chosen to arrange as so many chapters in his book. Our taste, we confess, does not readily approve this method. It is affecting a unity which does not in fact exist.

The volume commences with a chapter extracted from "The Planter's Plea," and a chapter from Hubbard's History. The Planter's Plea was printed in London in 1630, and has generally been ascribed to Rev. John White of Dorehester, commonly called in his day Patriarch White; giving "a manifestation of the causes moving such as have lately undertaken a Plantation in N. England." The object kept in view by the author, or authors, of the narration, (for the opening sentence in the work would lead one to conclude that it was either the joint production of various hands, or else that it was put together by some one in behalf of several,) is to lay a "faithful and impartial narration of the first occasions, beginning, and progress of the whole work, before the eyes of all that desire to receive satisfaction, by such as have been privy to the very first conceiving and contriving of this project of planting this colony." It is evident, from this contemporaneous account of the inception of the Massachusetts settlement, that several attempts had previously been made to colonize this part of the North American coast, all of which had failed. Springing from views of interest, to facilitate trade, these attempts came quickly to nought. It was not appointed in Providence to the "western merchants" of England, — who had in their eye nothing more than "a trade of fishing for cod and bartering for furs in these parts," — it was not appointed to them to colonize New England. They were competent, with such views, to dig bait, and pilot their craft across the the ocean, and throw the line for cod; they might have nerve enough to let their vessel return without them, and to see the door shut against their egress from the wilderness, if their sojourn here were to be only for one year or for a single season. But this was not the stuff that Commonwealths are made of. There would have been no New England, if it had rested with codfish and Bristol traders.

Nothing but a far-seeing, profound Christian faith could furnish sufficient foundation for such an enterprise and achievement. To have turned their backs for life upon "dear England" — "the lady of the sea," as old Camden, the learned, pleasantly styles her — was no easy matter for men and women that had inhaled her wholesome air, and tilled her garden-soil, and had sweet homes nestling in her green nooks. With what hooks of steel would a natural and commendable pride of country fasten their hearts to their native land! Its very stones were diamonds in their eyes. Its deeds and achievements were most famous. They could all understand the feeling, with which a contemporary writer, in an ecstasy of national pride, exclaims, "Good Lord, how spaciouly might a learned pen walk in this argument!"

Chapter third in Mr. Young's work consists of the "Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England." This will probably be looked upon, and with reason, as the most valuable document in the volume. The records are "now for the first time printed from the original manuscript in the archives of the Commonwealth."

From chapter fourth to chapter tenth inclusive, we have a series of documents which are intimately connected with the Records of the Company just remarked upon, and therefore rightly placed by the editor. They are Cradock's Letter to Endicott; The Company's First and Second Letters of Instructions to Endicott; The Form of Government for the Colony; The Allotment of the Lands; The Oaths of Office for the Governor and Council; and the Company's Agreement with the Ministers.

It is a curious feature in the Instructions to Endicott, that the Company forbid the culture of tobacco, devil's weed, as the loyal subjects of King James regarded it, and as it in reality is. "We especially desire you to take care that no tobacco be planted by any of the new planters under your government, unless it be some small quantity for mere necessity, and for physic, for preservation of their healths; and that the same be taken privately by ancient men, and none others." If only those should make use of tobacco, who could plead "mere necessity," or the "preservation of their healths," the company of those, of the

masculine and feminine gender, who puff, snuff, chew and spit, would be very perceptibly diminished.

In their Instructions, the Company show themselves disposed to treat the "Old Planters," so called, with great fairness and generosity. But little is known with certainty respecting these "Old Planters." Mr. Young remarks in a note, "The Planters in Massachusetts Bay at this time were Mr. Blackstone at Shawmut (Boston); Thomas Walford at Mishawum (Charlestown); Samuel Maverick at Noddle's Island (East Boston); and David Thompson at Thompson's Island near Dorchester. How or when they came there, is not known."

With regard to Thompson, it is known when he came to this island, as will appear in the following extract, which we had occasion some years since to copy from the Colony Records in the State archives:—

"10th 3d month 1648. — Forasmuch as it appears to this court upon the petition of Mr. John Thomson, son and heir of David Thomson deceased, that the said David in or about the year 1626, did take actual possession of an Island in the Massachusetts Bay, called Thomson's Island, and being then vacuum domicilium, and before the Patent granted to us of the Massachusetts Bay, and did erect there the form of an habitation, and dying soon after, leaving the petitioner an infant, who so soon as he came to age, did make his claim formerly and now again, by his said petition. This Court, considering the premises, and not willing to deprive any of their lawful right, and possession, or to permit any prejudice to come to the petitioner in the time of his nonage, do hereby grant the said Island, called Thomson's Island, to the said John Thomson and his heirs forever, to belong to this jurisdiction, and to be under the government and laws thereof."

Chapters eleventh and twelfth consist of Higginson's Journal of his Voyage to New England, and Higginson's "New England's Plantation." Of the last mentioned of these works three editions appeared in the course of a single year. Higginson was one of those whom Dudley charges with dealing in "too large commendations of the country and the commodities thereof." "Honest men, who, out of a desire to draw over others to them, wrote somewhat hyperbolically of many things here." He does bepraise everything. Even the climate is perfect in his estimation. "For here is an extraordinary clear and dry

air, that is of a most healing nature to all such as are of a cold, melancholy, phlegmatic, rheumatic temper of body." Of all complaints under the moon, to prescribe "a sup of New England's air" for *rheumatism*! For our part we can, on a blue spring day, with the wind east, fancy we hear Prospero directing Ariel or some other of "the powers of the air":

"Go charge my goblins that they grind their joints
With dry convulsions; shorten up their sinews
With aged cramps; and more pinch-spotted make them
Than pard or cat o' mountain."

"And whereas," continues Higginson, "before time I clothe myself with double clothes and thick waistcoats to keep me warm, even in the 'summer time' I do now go as thin clad as any, only wearing a light stuff cassock upon my shirt, and stuff breeches of one thickness without linings." Very conceivable all this; for he wrote from July to September. And if he had been here in August, 1846, this blessed year, he might have stood equipped like him whom old Camden says somebody "painted for an Englishman, a proper fellow naked, with a pair of tailer's sheares in one hand, and a piece of cloth on his arm, with these rimes:

'I am an Englishman, and naked I stand here,
Musing in my mind what garments I shall weare;
For now I will weare this, and now I will weare that,
Now I will weare, I cannot tell what.'

This exaggeration in the conceptions and descriptions of many of the writers of that period of English literature, is to our minds quite an interesting feature. That exquisite creation of Shakspeare, the *Tempest*, was the product, in a master's hand, of the same exaggeration with regard to the new-found countries of the West, that discovers itself, in a humbler way, in such writers as Higginson. We, in these days of short and easy intercourse between the two continents by means of steam-spiced ships, when everything here is taking the shape and hue of an Old World standard, can have little conception of the strength, vividness, intoxication of feeling, produced in those who came to the New World, or who read by their firesides of those who adventured into these romantic regions. Such prosaic

lumps of earth as Dudley might not indeed understand these illusions. But all who had, in the slightest degree, the element of poetry in their souls, were bewitched out of their propriety.

The scene of Shakspeare's *Tempest*, which was probably written in 1612 or thereabouts, and which, we think, ought to be read as a perfect illustration of the state of mind accompanying and consequent upon the discovery of America and attempts to colonize it, is generally supposed to be laid in the Bermuda Isles, which were discovered in his time, and from which shipwrecked mariners brought back to England strange and fearful accounts. But we are slow to pronounce as confidently as some as to the scene of the *Tempest*. The narrative of Sir George Somers and his companions, on their return from their shipwreck, would doubtless interest an imagination like Shakspeare's. But this was only one among numerous similar events, all exciting the same sentiment of wonder. The West was all a region of marvels and magic. Every vessel that returned from the *new found land*, brought its tale of "sea-sorrow," or its descriptions of countries, vegetable productions, races of men and animals, that were devoured by a credulous curiosity. He, whose genius could despatch an Ariel

"——— to fetch dew

From the still-vexed Bermoothes,"

would never lack obedient ministers to run or swim or fly on the errands of his imagination, and to bring back tidings from the vast region of adventure in the West. "Come unto these yellow sands," was the sweet charm that drew all the imaginative spirits of that age across the deep to strange shores. There, — beyond the influence of a corrupt state of society, — in the wilderness, the pure-minded philosophers of the age, like the "noble Neapolitan Gonzalo," placed the seat of their imaginary Commonwealths, which were to be governed with such perfection, "to excel the golden age." There, away from conventional modes of feeling and language, the poet pictured the scene between Ferdinand and Miranda, and under a clear sky, on a soil teeming with new flowers and fruits, called upon the spirits that preside over the air, the earth and the waters, to assemble, with their joint influences on the heart,

"A contract of true love to celebrate."

There, especially, was the fancied birth-place and residence of such monsters as Caliban, which is generally regarded as one of the master-pieces of Shakspeare's art. The vulgar curiosity which prevailed in England in that age with regard to the native inhabitants of the New World, is well hit off in the language put in the mouth of Trinculo, when he encounters Caliban, — "Were I in England now, (as once I was), and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver: there would this monster make a man; any strange beast there makes a man: when they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian." We see in Caliban the leading characteristics of the savage aborigines of America. With all his deformities he is a poetical character. His conceptions and the language put in his mouth are poetical. He comes in close contact with the lovely and grand forms of nature, and receives deep and suitable impressions from them. In the first period of his acquaintance with the civilized man he loves him, serves him patiently, receives gladly from him instruction, and repays the obligation by showing him "all the qualities of the isle." In course of time he drops his love of his superior, and retains only dread of him. He frets that his inheritance is taken from him, and curses the being whose superhuman intelligence, aided by spirits which he has under his control, has made him a slave. He comes in contact, too, with the vices of civilized life. He receives the fatal gift of the intoxicating draught. He is exhilarated by it, and fancies the gift and the giver have "dropped from heaven." He makes a god of the drunken butler, worships him, and forms a plan for the destruction of his former master. We repeat, that the *Tempest* of Shakspeare deserves to be studied as illustrating the thoughts and feelings that influenced men's minds in the age when America was settled by European civilization.

The next chapter in the *Chronicles of Massachusetts* is entitled "General Considerations for the Plantation in New England; with an Answer to several Objections"; which Mr. Savage ascribes to Governor Winthrop. Then follows the Agreement at Cambridge, so called, made August 26, 1629, signed by Saltonstall, Winthrop, Johnson, Dudley and others; in which they bind themselves to be ready in

their persons and with such of their several families as are to go with them, to embark for the Plantation of New England by the first of March ensuing: "Provided always," — and this was a pregnant provision, — "that before the last of September next, the whole Government, together with the patent for the said Plantation, be first, by an order of court, legally transferred, and established to remain with us and others which shall inhabit upon the said Plantation."

The Company's Letters to Higginson and Endicott are followed in Mr. Young's collection by the well known "Humble Request," signed by Winthrop and others, and addressed "to the rest of their brethren in and of the Church of England." This has often been quoted, and for strong natural feeling, beautifully and touchingly expressed, it deserves frequent quotation. "We esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother; and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart and many tears in our eyes, ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation, we have received in her bosom and sucked it from her breast." All this is tender in sentiment, simple, natural and beautiful in language. But it ought, we think, in justice to the Pilgrim settlers of the old Plymouth Colony to be remembered, that they were in advance of their neighbors of the Bay, and they ought to have all the honor that may arise from this circumstance awarded to them. The historians tell us that they were Separatists in principle, while the Massachusetts colonists were only Non-conformists. But all who came into the wilderness must be in fact Separatists, as they soon found. Their churches here must be independent. Their circumstances obliged them to adopt, what the minds of the bolder thinkers among the Puritans suggested and prompted to previously, — a distinct church polity of their own. We would not accuse the colonists of the Bay of directly joining in the vulgar abuse bestowed on the Plymouth colony on account of their separating boldly and avowedly from the Church of England. But they felt the pressure, doubtless, of the current prejudice against that colony. They would fain save themselves from the jealousies, political as well as religious,

of which their future neighbors were the objects. They were at the first timidly cautious not to identify themselves with the Separatists of Plymouth. The followers of the catholic Robinson are entitled to the honor, which was in their day a reproach, of first publishing and acting on the principle of separation from the corrupt and arrogant Church of England.

Chapter seventeenth consists of Deputy Governor Dudley's well-known Letter to the Countess of Lincoln; and next in order we have the Memoir of Captain Roger Clap. This is curious and instructive, as coming from a person in the humbler walks of life, one who had had, probably, little or no education, except what he had acquired indirectly from sitting under the pulpit instructions of learned, pious, and zealous Christian ministers. It proves that the men and women of that rank in life among the Puritan colonists of New England had learned how to think to some practical purpose. They had opinions of their own, convictions deep, sincere, earnest, on all the great subjects that concern man's life and well-being in this world and in the world to come. They were intelligent themselves, and knew how to express themselves intelligibly to others. Such persons prove to us, better than most others, the power of religion, when it takes strong hold of human nature, to elevate the whole mind and character, to excite in its possessor a just self-respect, to impart to life a solemn interest, to open the resources of the soul, to furnish an inward and never failing supply of motive, and to change the occasional good impressions and the virtuous impulses and motions that spontaneously visit all minds, into what the Christian Scriptures term, with so much beauty and significance, "the everlasting life" in the soul. Instead of an occasional virtue or grace springing up like the green blade that starts from seed cast in soil where there is no depth of earth, there is given to the soul by religion an inward fountain, and on its margin is perpetual verdure. There is a perennial life imparted by faith to the conscience. "The water" that religion gives to a man, "is in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "Bread," says the homely Memoir of Roger Clap, "was so very scarce, that sometimes I thought the very crusts of my father's table would have been very sweet unto me.

And when I could have meal and water and salt boiled together, it was so good, who could wish better?" And again he says, "God's holy spirit in those days was pleased to accompany the word with such efficacy upon the hearts of many, that our hearts were taken off from Old England and set upon heaven. The discourse not only of the aged, but of the youth also, was not, 'How shall we go to England?' (though some few did not only so discourse, but also went back again,) but 'How shall we go to heaven?'" It was such convictions and motives, and not codfish adventures and calculations of mercantile profit and loss, that settled New England, and made the "wilderness blossom."

This same Roger Clap, it appears, was Captain of "the Castle." "The history of the Castle," says Mr. Young, in an interesting note, "from its commencement to the present time, deserves to be recorded." As early as 1634, it seems, the first settlers of Massachusetts saw good, for their common defence, to fortify an island three miles from Boston. "At first they built a castle with mud walls, which stood divers years." We find from the old Records, that on the 30th of 7th month, 1639, "there was granted to Thomas Foster, the gunner at the Castle Island, a great lot at the Mount (i. e. Mount Wollaston, afterwards Braintree, now Quincy) for three heads." In the Dutch war, during the anxiety occasioned by the report, in July, 1665, that De Ruyter, with a squadron of ships, intended to visit the Bay, the "battery was repaired, wherein are seven good guns." Just at this time, the "worthy, renowned Captain Richard Davenport" was struck dead at his post by lightning. "Upon which the General Court, in August 10th following, appointed another captain, in the room of him that was slain." And we doubt not that, if De Ruyter had paid his threatened visit to the Bay, that other captain, our Captain Roger, would have made the "seven good guns" of the castle talk loud and strong English to the Dutchman. To one who visits the island now, and examines the costly and durable fortifications which the general government, with millions at their command, are erecting, there is food for thought, and he may chew the cud of fancy, as he contrasts the magnificent works of the America of to-day with the rude and simple defences of

two centuries back. We hope, with Mr. Young, that when the works now in progress on the island are completed, the ancient name of "the Castle" will be restored.

Next in order comes an extract from the Charlestown Records, which, we think, might, without any great loss, have been omitted. The Record is allowed by the editor not to be "a contemporaneous document, but a digest from early papers and tradition." Judging from the blunders it contains, the man who made the *digest*, must have swallowed his facts with a voracious credulity that interfered with the digestion. All that it contains worth preserving might as well, we think, have been given by Mr. Young in notes.

Chapter twentieth contains an extract from William Wood's "New England's Prospect." Nothing seems to be known of this writer, except what he tells us of himself. It appears from his own account, that he had resided in the country four years at least, even if he did not afterwards return hither, and "the end of his travel was observation." He was, very likely, employed by those who were interested in the growth of the Plantations, to indite his "true, lively, and experimentall description of that part of America commonly called New England, laying down that which may both enrich the knowledge of the mind-travelling reader, or benefit the future voyager." We can imagine the "mind-travelling readers" of that day wending their way to the shop of John Bellamie, "at the three Golden Lyons in Cornhill, neere the Royal Exchange," and making eager inquiries after the latest book on America. In his description of the several plantations belonging to the Massachusetts Colony, he begins with that farthest to the south, — Weymouth. He then says, "Three miles to the north of this is Mount Walleston, a very fertile soil, and a place very convenient for farmers' houses, there being great store of plain ground without trees. This place is called *Massachusetts fields*," etc. Mr. Young, in a note on this passage, says, "This hill (i. e. Mount Walles-ton) in Quincy, near the shore, and not far from President Adams's seat, still bears the name of Mount Wollaston." The truth is, (though it did not fall in with Mr. Young's object to notice the fact,) that this was the name, not of a hill only, but of the whole plantation, afterwards called

Braintree, and including what is now Braintree, Randolph and Quincy, and extending from Weymouth on the south to Dorchester on the north. The hill near the shore, that still retains the name, is part of a farm which belongs to ex-President Adams, and which formerly belonged to John Quincy, his maternal grandfather, after whom he and the town of Quincy were named. Mount Wollaston, at the time Wood wrote, belonged to Boston, and many of the residents of Boston had their farms there. There Wheelwright, one of the fathers of New Hampshire, preached when the church at the Mount was a branch of the Boston First Church. There Atherton Hough, one of the prominent inhabitants of Boston, had a farm assigned him on a neck that still bears his name, and is called Hough's neck. There William Coddington had his farm, probably the very Mount Wollaston farm now belonging to President Adams. He was one of Wheelwright's most enlightened and zealous supporters in the Antinomian controversy, and went off in consequence of the issue of that controversy, and was chosen President or Governor of the Colony, which he helped to found, of Rhode Island. In the same place, also, the famous Braintree Company sat down for a while before they went to Newtown, and thence removed to Hartford, leaving a memorial of the temporary sojourn of the whole, and of the permanent residence of a part, of that Company, in the name which was subsequently given to the place when it was incorporated as a town. Moreover, Mr. Savage is of opinion that the settlement of Wollaston and his company was permanent at the Mount, and if so, as he remarks, it claims the credit of being the oldest permanent settlement in Massachusetts Colony. Furthermore, it gave to the State its noble name; for here, in a part of what is now Quincy, and was formerly Braintree, and still earlier Mount Wollaston, are what were called the "Massachusetts fields," as Wood tells us. Here the Massachusetts sagamore resided. In fact, the northern portion of the town is still called "the Farms" — a name which is, doubtless, traditionary, and derived from the times when the savage lord of this region, who had had it cleared for his own culture, transferred it for farms to the inhabitants of Boston. So that the town now called Quincy, occupies the spot where the earliest settlement was made in this Colony, fur-

nished a name to the State, supplied out of its bosom good materials for the settlement of three other States — Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire; and in later times, furnished one President of Congress — John Hancock, two Presidents of the United States — the elder and younger Adams, and has been the residence of two Presidents of our honored University — Leonard Hoar, whose monument is standing in the burial-ground of this ancient town, and President Quincy, who still lives (and long may he continue!) to enjoy the seat which he has inherited from the first Edmund Quincy, of Mount Wollaston memory.

Chapter twenty-first, in Mr. Young's volume, contains Whiting's Life of John Cotton, the famous Puritan preacher, who probably exerted more influence in the Colony than any other individual; together with three letters from Cotton. Next in the series we have Richard Mather's Journal. "The MS. of this Journal," remarks the editor, "which is now printed for the first time, was discovered in Dorchester, in November 1844, in a box of old papers, which had not been examined for twenty-five years." Richard, the progenitor of all the Mathers in this country, came over in 1635, and was minister of Dorchester, in this Colony, from 1636, till he died, in 1669. Had his Journal never been fished up from oblivion by antiquarian patience, the world would probably have been quite as wise as at present. It was hardly worth printing. Anthony Thacher's Narrative of his Shipwreck follows Mather's Journal; and the volume concludes with Thomas Shepard's Memoir of his own Life.

It is hardly fair, when an editor has done his work so well as Mr. Young, and furnished such an attractive book out of old, neglected materials, to complain of what may have been left undone. But we cannot avoid saying how much we should have been pleased with seeing, in a work of this sort, more pictorial illustrations. We have one good head of Winthrop in the front of the volume. But why not Endicott, Leverett, Wilson? Then, too, that parish church in Boston, Old England, in which the famous Cotton preached before he emigrated, and which President Everett went to visit and which he so beautifully alluded to in his speech at Plymouth, on Forefathers' Day, 1845, — it would have done our hearts good to have seen an authentic

and accurate sketch of it in this volume. There is the old meetinghouse, too, at Hingham, which is said to be the oldest in New England, and which is now a most venerable and singular relic of early times, carrying back the beholder to within a few years of the first settlement of the country. Such objects, when seen, do not a little to help our conceptions of the times of which history preserves the literary record. We think, too, that the charter granted to the Massachusetts Company might have found a very appropriate place in these Chronicles. It has been printed, it is true; but it is not very accessible, and the insertion of it here would to us have enhanced the value of the book. But we prefer to thank Mr. Young for the good work he has done, rather than indulge in complaint or criticism. The notes in this volume are of very great interest and value. They present in an agreeable shape the results of much study, (how much can be estimated only by those who have engaged in investigations of this kind,) patient collection of time-worn manuscripts, extensive and accurate acquaintance with the labors of his predecessors in the same field of literature, scrupulous and praiseworthy reference to his authorities, and as we have before remarked, hearty love of his subject. The writings of our forefathers in reference to their great work of settling this continent have an intrinsic value, which antiquarians and professed students will not fail to discover and estimate. But the lessons they contain, and the virtues they exhibit, ought not to remain in the possession of the few whose tastes incline them to the study of past times. It is desirable that they should be familiar to the great body of our people. To effect this object, by presenting to the public, in an attractive shape, and with the necessary elucidations, documents which have grown musty and obsolete, is the important, and by no means easy office of an editor. The old Bay State (God save her!) as she has been through all her generations past, as she is at this day, — what nobler monument could the heroic Puritans have left to perpetuate their name and fame? Her children are with reason proud of her. She has a history worth recording, worthy of profound study. We know no more honorable employment for the wits or pens of her scholars, than to illustrate that history. And we conclude with saying, Honor to him who helps to do honor to the Puritans.

W. P. L.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Miscellanies consisting of I. Letters to Dr. Channing on the Trinity. II. Two Sermons on the Atonement. III. Sacramental Sermon on the Lamb of God. IV. Dedication Sermon—Real Christianity. V. Letter to Dr. Channing on Religious Liberty. VI. Supplementary Notes and Postscripts of New Additional Matter. By M. STUART, Prof. Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Institution at Andover. Andover. 1846. 12mo. pp. 369.

THE title above given will serve for a table of contents to the volume, which the Professor wishes "to bequeath" as his "legacy,"—the legacy of his opinions,—to posterity, containing his "latest testimony" on the subjects treated. It embraces, as will be seen, matter both old and new. On the old we shall offer no comment. It belongs to the past, and can possess, we should suppose, no interest for any one, at the present day, except the historian of opinions. A considerable amount of new matter is added in the form of postscripts, which contain rambling remarks on almost all sorts of subjects connected with theology and theological parties. These postscripts will add nothing to the author's posthumous reputation. While portions of them bear marks of his once vigorous intellect, others show a senile garrulousness, occasionally something worse.

A more undignified piece of criticism, less worthy of a scholar and a gentleman, than the remarks on Mrs. Dana's Letters, it has seldom been our lot to meet. The Professor's attack on this lady we hesitate not to pronounce unmanly, coarse, and unchristian. It is in the worst style of partisan newspaper abuse, and had the piece been offered for insertion in the journals of the day, it would have been rejected, we think, by almost any editor of reputable standing. It is absolutely insulting. The Professor attempts, in a strain of awkward ridicule and clumsy witticism, to chastise the lady for presuming to meddle in matters of theology. The idea of such a thing he seems to think quite ridiculous. As if a lady had no business to form an opinion respecting the Object of Christian worship, and state the grounds of that opinion to the public, should she choose! Really the Professor appears to rate woman's understanding and privileges very low. He is a very Mahometan in his estimate of the sex.

The "head and front" of Mrs. Dana's offending is, that having from reading the Scriptures and from her own reflections alone, and without an acquaintance with any Unitarian writings,

gone over from the Orthodox faith to Unitarianism, she was led to pursue her inquiries and read Unitarian books, and being fully confirmed in her change of views, she, in the course of the last year, published a volume of Letters addressed to her relatives and friends, defending her new views of Christianity, which had been to her a source of great joy and consolation. (*See Christian Examiner for Nov. 1845, pp. 349 et seqq.*) The volume proved popular and has had an extensive circulation, and finally fell into the hands of Professor Stuart, whereupon he greatly marvels, and is "filled with a variety of conflicting emotions." "An extraordinary woman," * * "thus to venture, clad in masculine armor, upon tilt and tournament, on a field where none but those trained to the use of arms are wont to appear. It was the first time, within the compass of my reading, that I had ever met with such an occurrence."—p. 197. Solomon, the Professor goes on to say, had he lived in these days, would have found occasion to review his adage,—"there is nothing new under the sun." We are sorry that the Professor's reading is so limited, especially in the department of female authors. Perhaps his contempt for woman's understanding has prevented him from looking into such writers as Harriet Martineau and Joanna Baillie, both of whom, to say nothing of others, have written in defence of Unitarianism. The Professor proceeds, in quite a frisky style, to talk about what gallantry to the ladies requires, and does not require; what one is to do or expect, when he enters the list with a "lady-combatant," or "lady-knight," for so he facetiously calls the author of the Letters. He turns her "sufferings," to which she alludes in connexion with her change of faith and the struggles of different kinds she was compelled to pass through, into ridicule; jests upon her sensibility; throws out innuendos about "the *exquisite* and the *sentimental*;" and even ventures, if we understand him, to suggest a doubt of her veracity. Really, this exceeds the ordinary license of partisan criticism. Has every particle of humanity died out of the venerable Professor? Is this the fruit of a long life of theological study?

After four or five pages filled with cold-blooded sneers and such poor attempts at wit as we have described, the veteran theologian goes on to point out what he conceives to be some critical errors into which the "lady-combatant" has fallen. Whether in this he is successful or not, is of very little consequence so far as the general merits of her book are concerned. Others fall into errors sometimes. Perhaps Mr. Stuart, by a little effort of recollection, can recal a critique once offered by a New Haven Professor on a certain performance of his own, which was not thought to have left him wholly unscathed. At all events others have not forgotten it.

Mr. Norton and others come in for the usual quantity of abuse from Professor Stuart. The College question is again brought under review. The Professor must have a last word upon that, and leave on record his "latest testimony" to the "exclusiveness" of Unitarians in regard to the management of the University. Some of his remarks on this subject convey an erroneous impression, and are, to say the least, on the very brink of falsehood. He complains bitterly of Unitarian influence at the University. But what is the remedy? Are all sects in the Commonwealth to "have their representatives in the University," or a "place in one of the Boards," or "among the Faculty"? No, no, says the Professor, God save us from that. This would bring in "Universalists, Abner Kneeland's men, Fanny Wright's suitors, the *Come-outers*, the Hegelian Transcendentalists, the Parkerites, the Swedenborgians, *et id genus omne*," and "would indeed be the utter ruin of the respectability of the University." What then is to be done? The Professor acknowledges his embarrassment. On the whole, however, he proposes to "give up the University to the Unitarians," they, on their part, giving up "to the Orthodox, all the funds," which the latter "have ever contributed, and all the books and apparatus which they formerly collected, or at least the value of them, and also the value of the buildings which they erected, and their proportion of the donations which the *State* has made to the University."—p. 358. In this proposal the Professor appears to be entirely in earnest, it being of no use, he says, to "carry on the contest about Cambridge any longer, after the manner of times that are past." If something of the kind which he proposes is not done, he intimates that the Orthodox, who, he says, "have a large majority in the State," may by and by rise, and "having control of the Legislature," proceed to remodel the University, introducing a "*test*, that would man the Institution through and through with Orthodoxy."

Having despatched the matter of the University, the Professor next proceeds to open his battery upon the Judiciary of the Commonwealth, the decisions of which he is confident have been warped by these same dreadful Unitarian influences, and so the churches have been despoiled of their rights, and have been "*disfranchised*." On this subject he has some pages of indignant remark. And what remedy does he propose here? Why, the whole, "is a just matter for *legislative interference*."—p. 368. (The italics are the Professor's.) But, what then becomes of the independence of our "high courts of Justice," which a few pages back the writer pronounces the "very life-guard in the temples of liberty"? And what validity have their decisions? None at all, as every one must see, and charters, contracts, rights long considered as settled, are to be submitted

to the ballot box at popular elections. This is being a little more of a nullifier, or radical, than we had heretofore supposed the Professor to be.

Since the Professor has left the sentiments contained in this volume as a "legacy" to posterity, the public may be curious to know in what form of Orthodoxy he finally reposes, it having been sometimes found difficult to class him. We will pass over other points, and say one word as to his "latest" views of the Trinity. First, then, he would banish the "word *person*" from all "Church-creeds."—p. 75. This is something. How then does he illustrate and define the Trinity? He makes it analogous to *understanding*, *will* and *reason* in man, the first of which "perceives and comprehends," the second "decides," and the third "ponders, compares," etc.; yet all make up one soul, which is also sometimes said to do what is at other times attributed to its separate faculties.—p. 214. This is an old illustration, which has not generally been accounted Orthodox, we believe, in modern times. The Trinity so explained is termed a "modal Trinity," which in reality is no Trinity at all. We greatly err if the Professor's exposition satisfies all his friends. After his long life of "investigation, study, and experience," and all the vituperation he has poured out, and is still pouring out, against the Unitarians, we see not but he ends in downright Sabellianism, which is only a sort of misty Unitarianism.—We conclude with expressing the hope that the Professor will find more mercy at the bar of heaven, than he has been disposed to show to his fellow Christians on earth.

L.

An Examination of the Testimony of the Four Evangelists, by the Rules of Evidence administered in Courts of Justice. With an account of the Trial of Jesus. By SAMUEL GREENLEAF, L.L. D., Royall Professor of Law in Harvard University. Boston: Little & Brown. 1846. 8vo. pp. 543.

IF this had been called "A Harmony of the Gospels, with Preliminary Remarks," we should have received it as a valuable contribution from an eminent jurist to our theological literature;—valuable as an expression of his sincere and intelligent faith in the Christian records, and valuable for the judicious remarks which he has prefixed to his arrangement of the Gospels. That it will be of service, in arresting the attention of a class of men who are perhaps too ready to be influenced by the objections of skeptics, and turn away from the New Testament without bestowing proper examination on its narratives, is probable; and we thank Professor Greenleaf for giving the weight of his name to the sufficiency of the Christian Evidences. But the title of the

volume, we are constrained to say, is not only too ambitious, but in a certain sense deceptive. At least, if others take it up with the expectations which the title created in our mind, they will be greatly disappointed. The "examination of the testimony of the four Evangelists" is confined to forty-eight pages of introductory matter, a very few brief notes in connexion with the text of the Gospels, and an appendix of thirty-one pages, eleven of which are filled with an abridgment of an article by Professor Robinson, published in the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*," on the best method of harmonizing the accounts of the Resurrection. The remaining four hundred and seventy-five pages consist of the text of the four Gospels, arranged as a harmony, (with the notes of which we have spoken, making in all perhaps twenty pages,) a Synopsis, and a Table of passages. Now we submit, that the title which the author has chosen is a singular misnomer for such a volume. Why the title-page should make special mention of "an account of the trial of Jesus" which occupies only nine pages, we cannot explain, unless it betoken his judgment respecting the amount of original matter which he had contributed to the work. Professor Greenleaf adopts the supposition of four passovers included within our Lord's ministry, which seems to us to have much less probability than the shorter period of fifteen months. His notes do not discover a wide acquaintance with theological or critical writings, but they are free from pretension and generally are founded on correct criticism. We cannot speak of them, however, as adding anything to the stores of biblical learning. If Professor Greenleaf had published his "Preliminary Observations" as a pamphlet, we should have been grateful for a clear and able vindication of the Evangelists' right to be accepted as faithful witnesses; but in the volume which he has given to the public, though he speaks once and again of the "plan of the work," we are unable to see either original conception or extraordinary execution. c.

Discourses of Rev. Edward H. Edes, with a Sketch of his Life.

Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 12mo. pp. 280.

ANOTHER is added to the small but choice catalogue of volumes commemorative of deceased ministers of our denomination. The subject of that now under notice was not so widely known, nor so conspicuously useful, as some of those amongst whose memorials on the shelves of our libraries we make room for his; but so far as a pure, righteous and faithful life, spent in the service of God and man, entitles one to respect while living and to remembrance after death, the name of Mr. Edes deservedly ranks with those of the beloved and honored clergymen to whose society his spirit has ascended.

The memoir appears to have been written with an affectionate and truthful pen. It is a brief sketch of a well regulated life, diversified by no striking incidents, but by no means devoid of interest to the Christian reader, since it shows the steady and uniform progress of a virtuous soul — the gradual ripening of a religious character whose seeds were sown in early life under the influence of a Christian mother. His history is soon told. He was born in Boston in 1803; prepared for College at the Academies of Bridgewater and Exeter; remained at Harvard University for two years, when the death of his mother, upon whom he relied in part for his support, and his own ill health made it necessary for him to give up a student's sedentary life; entered into business and failed; devoted himself to the more congenial labor of preparation for the ministry; graduated from the Theological School at Cambridge in 1831; was settled first at Eastport, and subsequently at Augusta and Kennebunk in Maine, and died, while on a visit in his native city, on the 30th of May 1845. His constitution was feeble, and during the whole period of his ministry he was compelled to struggle with imperfect health and a weak voice. But he struggled manfully; patiently endured many trials; and successfully performed many labors; made himself an acceptable preacher, and left behind him at each removal many warm friends and a clear impression of his virtuous influence.

The volume contains fourteen sermons on a variety of topics, written with care and earnestness — the earnestness of deep religious feeling. No one can read them without being convinced that their author was a man of thoughtfulness, independence and unaffected piety, who prepared himself for the pulpit under a strong sense of responsibility to God and with a sincere desire to promote the moral and spiritual improvement of his hearers. They are creditable alike to the mind and the heart of the preacher, and will be read with interest and profit, we hope, by many beyond the circle of his former friends and parishioners, who will dwell upon the pages of this volume with peculiar satisfaction, and preserve these relics of their affectionate and faithful teacher with a sacred care.

R.

The Worship of Genius, and The Distinctive Character, or Essence of Christianity. By Professor C. ULLMANN. Translated from the German, by Lucy Sandford. London: Chapman, Brothers. 1846. 12mo. pp. 116.

DR. STRAUSS, in an article on "The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity," took occasion to say, that "the only worship left to the cultivated of this age from the religious disorganization of the last, is the worship of genius." This

remark stimulated Ullmann, Theological Professor at Heidelberg, to write the above-mentioned book. The following is a brief analysis. He first defines what he considers to be the true worship of genius, viz., the universal affectionate homage paid to every phase of art; and his statement is quite liberal. He then distinguishes, with considerable acuteness, the so-called worship of genius from the sentiment of religion, whose object is the Infinite Father, and is not restricted "to the cultivated of this age." Then follows the position: "Jesus is not merely a man of the highest genius." We believe this certainly, but we must say that it is not in consequence of the Professor's logic. There is a vague hint about an Atonement as being a distinctive quality of Jesus. In addition to which, he only insists upon the personal claim of Jesus, — that he was the Son of God; still leaving the question open for an opponent to show, that Christ meant what *he* believes, and also that the union of Christ with God was such as could only take place by the immediate exercise of the Divine will, which leaves a whole philosophy of inspiration unestablished. The Essay is chiefly valuable for its clear expression of the Christian doctrine of the Divine immanence, as opposed to the old view of a God afar off, and the Pantheistic view of an impersonal substratum of nature and spirit. This bears upon the question concerning Christ, because Pantheism leaves unexplained the fact of sin. So far very good: but Professor Ullmann adds that the fact of sin renders necessary a Redeemer, and not believing in the popular theory of atonement, he unfortunately fails to show what in Christ's influence is so peculiar as to distinguish him *in kind* from a person of the highest genius; which should have been proved.

The "Distinctive Character, or, Essence of Christianity," forms the second Essay. Its point is briefly this:—Christ redeems by the power of his life, and this life has its central point of vitality, viz.: "the perfect union in his person of the Divine and human, which is the potential destiny of the race."

W.

Shakspeare's Dramatic Art: and his relation to Calderon and Goethe. Translated from the German of Dr. HERMANN ULRICH. London: Chapman, Brothers. 1846. 8vo. pp. 554.

WITH the exception of a faint evangelical savor, a fault not common to German aesthetics, this book is very fine. Its chief merit and design are this: it establishes the essential Christianity of Shakspeare. The author gives a clear and admirable definition of Christian dramatic art, as shown, for instance, in Shakspeare's historical dramas:—"on one side God with His love and justice, and on the other human activity in its contra-

riety of objective and subjective freedom, (the one coinciding with moral necessity — the other with human caprice)." We are, therefore, not surprised to read of the tragic, and of the comic, "aspect of the Christian view of Providence." The former is based upon "the Divine justice and moral necessity as the leading principles of history and the arbiters of men's fortunes:" the latter, upon "the Divine love, with the motley play of human caprice, as the leading principles of man's life and destiny." This antithesis is admirably elaborated and explained by Dr. Ulrici, who seems to unite the piety and speculative aptness of the German to the nervous common-sense of the Anglo-Saxon. Nor do we mean to insinuate that this union is uncommon in the fatherland of thought.

We acknowledge great delight at the manner in which the author applies his theory to Shakspeare, or rather illustrates it from the sources whence the theory was drawn. The book requires a much more extended notice than we are able here to give to it, and the impression we impart must necessarily be very vague. It must suffice to say, that he successfully meets the objections drawn from Shakspeare's forced and unnatural play of words, from his occasional coarseness, and from the introduction of the comic, and even of abuse, sarcasm, and banter, into his tragedies. These very objections assist Ulrici to render yet more luminous his theory of the two aspects of the Christian view of Providence.

His orthodoxy startles us in the following sentence:—"When I speak of the special purity and completeness with which Shakspeare has preserved the Christian view of things, I do not leave out of the account the doctrine of man's universal sinfulness, and the divine grace of redemption. They are not indeed, to be found in Shakspeare's view of things under the form of religious edification, moral instruction, or philosophical disquisition, *but still they are there*, and in a mode which in every respect is truly poetical." We hasten to avow ourselves as orthodox as Shakspeare, who, to our liking, has sweetened the pill till it ceases to be medicine.

Judging from infallible internal marks, not having seen the original German, we should say that the translation is of the first order. To Dr. Ulrici must be awarded the high praise of having explained to us, from the Christian point of view, that which we mean when we call Shakspeare "the great poet of Nature."

W.

Griselda. A Dramatic Poem. Translated from the German of FRIEDRICH HALM, by Q. E. D. London. 1844. 18mo. pp. 139.

THE plot of this drama, which a friend has sent us from England, is simple, but needlessly painful. Percival of Wales, a brave

but somewhat uncourtly knight, the lordly subject of King Arthur, charmed with the beauty, and still more with the modest virtues of Griselda, the daughter of a poor, blind collier, elevates her to his rank and makes her his wife. Amidst the splendor of a royal festival, Percival is twitted and ridiculed by Ginevra, queen of Arthur, for having wedded a woman of so humble birth. The knight of the Round Table vindicates her claim to his and their admiration, and the controversy waxes warm, till it is proposed to settle the matter by subjecting Griselda, who was absent, to a most cruel trial of her love. Percival, stung with indignation, and eager to prove his wife's fidelity, accepts the challenge, and amidst circumstances of pain and horror which we need not describe, secures his triumph over the queen and the ladies of her court. But at the moment of the injured woman's restoration to her home she loses her trust in a husband who could so trifle with all that is most sacred and holy in her love, and refusing to accept again his protection, returns heart-broken to die with her father in solitude.

Now what we say of this drama is, that it is a most distressing production, — made so by the peculiar nature of the incidents, — and need not have been written. We cannot see what valuable truth it teaches, with any justness or moderation. Undoubtedly it is a wicked and detestable thing for a husband to sport with his wife's feelings, and the less he allows himself to hear her disparaged, or to *argue* her goodness against thoughtless and malicious aspersions, the better. But on the other hand, the knights of King Arthur's days were not, we suppose, quite so cool headed or so Christian individuals as some of the respectable citizens of Victoria's. And accordingly Percival ought not to suffer so terrific a punishment. There appears to us an inconsistency in the conception of the principal incidents and characters of this poem. Until the moment of this unfortunate meeting between the Queen and Percival, Griselda had been all that a wife should be, and Percival, if he had not been all that the lord of so noble spirited and tender a woman should be, had at least kept her love, and his own love for her. We submit that the reader cannot find in the reason assigned a sufficient cause for the rupture of an affection that had borne and forborne, forgiven and survived, so long.

Of the literary execution of "Griselda" we can speak in high praise. The simplicity of the plot leaves little room for great skill in the management and progress of the piece or the development of the catastrophe; but the absence of intricacy hardly detracts from the interest. There are passages in the play written with great power, and showing a superior mastery of language, vigor and clearness of thought, and brilliancy of imagination, both in the author and the translator, who, we under-

stand, is an English lady. Indeed, we do not see why this drama may not take honorable rank with those of Mr. Talfourd and Mr. Sheridan Knowles. Perhaps exceptions might be taken to such poetical (?) liberties as "festal" (used three times as a substantive for *festival*), "wrath" (used twice as an adjective for *wroth*), "submiss," (for *submissive*), and a phrase so sadly elliptical as "when pleases me invite them." Generally the style is pure and strong, notwithstanding the deprecatory note at the beginning.

H.

Thoughts on the Poets. By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1846. 18mo. pp. 318.

THESE "Thoughts on the Poets" are criticisms upon various writers, who by their genius have become illustrious either in the past or the present. They are the thoughts of one who has the soul to appreciate what is beautiful and good, and who has shown in this volume not only that he can be moved by the thoughts of others, but that he can clearly and justly analyze their peculiar characteristics, that he can give us a reason for his having been interested; and by his discrimination he may lead some to turn with new pleasure to a favorite author, or to do more justice to one for whom they have felt an unreasonable aversion. Mr. Tuckerman's whole soul is, evidently, alive to the excellencies of those of whose writings he speaks. He dwells upon his subject with sincere delight, and this gives freshness to his remarks, and leads the mind to pause with readier sympathy over the many passages of peculiar beauty which are scattered through his pages. There is also a wide scope in regard to the authors considered. In proof of which we need only quote the names of Petrarch and Alfieri, Goldsmith and Gray, Cowper and Pope, Crabbe, Shelley, Byron, Hunt, Rogers, Burns, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Barry Cornwall, Hemans, Tennyson, Drake and Bryant. These he judges by a high standard and reads with a generous sympathy. We do not fully agree with all the views expressed, but the spirit throughout is pure and elevating, the style clear and forcible, and most of the criticisms just, and often such as display great sagacity and insight. The general merit of the book is its simplicity and quiet thoughtfulness. It is the work of a meditative mind, and yet a mind which can be stirred, and stirred deeply too, by high and holy thought.

W.

Memoir of Johann Gottlieb Fichte. By WILLIAM SMITH. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 157.

To those who read only for idle amusement this volume, republished from the English edition, will not prove particularly

attractive; but by the thoughtful, who are aware of Fichte's great fame, yet know little of his personal history, it will be eagerly read, and will amply repay perusal. Whatever may be said of Fichte's theories, his "practical philosophy," we believe it is universally admitted, was "of the purest character." He had an enthusiastic love of truth and goodness, and inspired it in the breasts of others. The following extract from the short, but fresh and sparkling preface to the American edition, will show the views and wishes of the editor.

"This excellent Memoir will probably establish Fichte among us. The English edition contains also a translation of one of his finest works, the "Nature of the Scholar." We look to see the success of this Memoir demand a republication of that also. It will be a seasonable word to our scholars, its lofty requisitions will deepen their earnestness, its merciless analysis will abolish trifling, its simple yet smiting appeals will cause them to venerate their vocation."

We hope that the editor will not be disappointed in the anticipated result of the publication. In his wish to see a reprint among us of the work alluded to we most heartily join. L.

The Acts of the Apostles, arranged for Families and Sunday Schools: with Notes and Questions. By T. B. Fox. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 18mo. pp. 136.

"THE Ministry of Christ" published by Mr. Fox several years ago has been widely circulated and favorably known as a manual for Sunday schools. The volume of which the title is given above is intended to follow the former, resembling it in size and appearance, and having been prepared after a similar plan. It lacks however the attractiveness which was given to its predecessor by the selections of poetry introduced to illustrate the acts and teachings of the Saviour. One hundred and five of its pages out of the whole number, (one hundred and thirty-six,) are occupied with the book of the Acts itself, transferred from the New Testament, with no alteration, as we have seen, except a different arrangement of chapters, and the disuse of the division and numbering of verses adopted in our common bibles. The questions appear to be judiciously prepared, and the notes, in which the most difficult of them are answered, are accurate and satisfactory so far as they go. If they had been more numerous and full, the book would in our opinion have possessed additional value. It can now, however, be advantageously used in connexion with Livermore's valuable commentary. R.

Efforts at Christian Culture. By MATTHIAS GREEN; being ten Discourses, delivered to the Unitarian Society, Newhall

Hill, Birmingham, including the Funeral Sermons of the late Edward Corn and the late Thomas Gibson. London. 1846. 12mo. pp. 142.

THE author of this little volume of Discourses is, we believe, a self-educated man, and he speaks of himself as elected "along with other members of the society" to which he belongs, to "conduct its ordinary public services." They are plain, serious performances, well adapted to the object for which they were prepared, and containing occasional references to the history of the society before which they were delivered, and the schools connected with it. The interest they possess must be chiefly local, yet they will prove further useful as affording an animating example of "efforts at Christian culture" among those who, with limited means, unite in the benevolent spirit of the Gospel for the worship of God and for moral and social improvement.

L.

Report on the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island, submitted Nov. 1, 1845. By HENRY BARNARD, Commissioner of Public Schools. Providence. 1846. 12mo. pp. 252.

THIS is one of the most thorough, business like, interesting Reports on the subject of Common Schools which have ever fallen under our eye, and deserves a far more extended notice than we can here give it. The Report itself contains a great deal of information on the condition, past and present, of the schools of Rhode Island, and is full of practical suggestions for their improvement, while the ample appendix gives various documents, statistical and other matter, among the rest a history of legislation in the State relating to public schools. For two hundred years the "great interest" of popular education in Rhode Island, "was unrecognised and unregulated by law." She is now nobly redeeming her character in this particular, and if she perseveres as she has begun, she will soon reap the fruits of her liberality and afford an encouraging example to the world.

L.

David Ellington. By HENRY WARE Jr. With other extracts from his Writings. Boston: Crosby and Nichols. 1846. 18mo. pp. 192.

THE contents of this volume, with one or two exceptions, originally appeared in the "Monthly Miscellany." They well deserve republication in the form in which they are here presented. Like everything of the kind from Mr. Ware's pen, they are written in an agreeable style, afford the best instruction, and have much more than a temporary interest.

G.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record.—Since the publication of our last number Rev. Mr. May of Leicester has relinquished his ministry in that place. —Rev. Mr. Folsom of Haverhill has closed his connexion with the church in that town. —Rev. Mr. Lloyd of Hubbardston has resigned his pastoral charge. —Rev. Mr. Clapp has dissolved his connexion with the church in Savannah, Geo., and has returned to the North. —Rev. Mr. Adam, who has been for several months preaching at Toronto, C. W., has removed to Chicago, Ill., where he will for a time supply the pulpit of the Unitarian society. —Rev. Mr. Capen has relinquished the charge of the ministry at large in Baltimore, Md. —Rev. Mr. Wellington has closed his labors in the city of New York, and the attempt to gather a third Unitarian society in that city is for the present suspended. —Rev. Dr. Dewey has accepted an invitation from the Unitarian society in Washington, D. C., to preach to them five months in the year, still leaving him free to fulfil the engagement with his congregation in New York of which we spoke in our last number.

Rev. Mr. Fenner, who graduated at the Cambridge Divinity School the last year, has accepted the invitation of the Unitarian society in Cincinnati, Ohio, to become their minister. —Rev. Mr. Winkley, who graduated from the same School this year, has accepted the appointment of a minister at large in Boston. —A portion of the society lately under the care of Rev. Mr. Muzzey of Cambridge, with others, have formed themselves into a new congregation, to whom he is now preaching. —The First Congregational society in Framingham, over whom Rev. Mr. Bellows was recently settled, are erecting a new meetinghouse. —The society at Westford are repairing their house of worship. —The Unitarian congregation at Troy, N. Y., have found it necessary to enlarge their house.

Cambridge Divinity School. —The thirtieth Annual Visitation of the Divinity School at Cambridge took place on Friday, July 17, 1846. The exercises were attended, as usual, in the College Chapel, President Everett presiding as head of the Theological Faculty of the University. Prayer was offered at the commencement of the exercises by Professor Noyes, and at the close by Professor Francis. Three hymns were sung in the course of the morning, written by members of the graduating class. The number of Dissertations read was twelve; one, by Mr. Henry B. Maglathlin, on "The opinion that man is not responsible for his faith," being omitted on account of his necessary absence. The subjects were as follows:—"The past and present value of ecclesiastical Councils"—Mr. Edwin G. Adams; "The moral doctrine and practice of the first three Centuries"—Mr. Thomas P. Allen; "How far is a doctrinal system useful or necessary?"—Mr. Robert S. Avery; "Our Saviour's purpose or purposes in forbidding the publication of his miracles"—Mr. George F. Clark; "Paul's doctrine of Justification by faith explained in harmony with

the teachings of Christ, and the views of James" — Mr. Octavius B. Frothingham; "The example of Christ as a religious teacher" — Mr. Samuel Johnson; "The reality and design of the Transfiguration" — Mr. Leonard J. Livermore; "The true ground of unity in the Church" — Mr. Samuel Longfellow; "The character and influence of Zwingli" — Mr. Farrington McIntire; "Christianity in France" — Mr. Washington Very; "The love of popularity in a pastor" — Mr. Samuel H. Winkley. The dissertations occupied from fifteen to twenty minutes each, and were heard by an audience that nearly filled the chapel.

After dining together in Harvard Hall, the Alumni of the Divinity School held their annual meeting, Professor Francis presiding, and reelected the officers of the last year. Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D. of Boston, was chosen to deliver the Address on the next anniversary in case of the failure of Rev. Dr. Noyes, elected the last year. It was voted, that the meetings of this Association for business be held in future at 9 o'clock A. M. on the day of the Annual Visitation, instead of 3 o'clock P. M., to allow more time for discussion. The subject of the Peace Address lately received from Unitarian Ministers in Great Britain and Ireland having been brought before the meeting, it was *Resolved*, "That a Committee be appointed to prepare a reply to the letter lately received from ministers of our faith in Great Britain on the subject of peace, and to send it to England in behalf of those who may think proper to sign it." Messrs. Gannett of Boston, Stetson of Medford, and Bellows of New York were appointed as this Committee. One or two subjects were brought before the notice of the Association, but the single hour which alone was at the command of the Association, left no time for their consideration.

At 4 o'clock the Annual Address was delivered in the College Chapel by Rev. William B. O. Peabody D. D. of Springfield, on the Christian idea of Priest and King, or, the union of holiness and power in the Christian character. We hope to lay it before our readers in our next number.

The annual discourse before the graduating class of the Divinity School, delivered always on the Sunday evening before the Visitation, in the meetinghouse of the First Parish in Cambridge, was preached this year by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg, from Acts vi. 10, on the sources of power in a preacher; which were presented under the five heads of an earnest personal faith, singleness of purpose, a clear apprehension of the end to be effected, an acquaintance with the philosophy of the human mind, and an adaptation to the wants of the time in which the preacher lives.

Meadville Theological School. — The Annual Exhibition of this School took place on Thursday, July 2, 1846. The Report of the Visitors presents a very favorable view of its condition. Twenty-three students read dissertations; — thirteen in the Junior class, seven in the Middle, and three in the Senior; — as follows. The Parables — J. L. Towner; The scenery of Palestine — C. M. Taggart; Conscience — H. B. Poyer; The supreme law in morals — Noah Michael; Heresy — Samuel M'Kown; Intimations in nature of the doctrine of immortality — J. W. Mackintosh; Principles of interpretation — E. W. Humphrey; Seasonableness of the time when Christ appeared — B. D. Himebough; The emotions as connected with

religion—William Cushing; Hume on the Christian miracles—Alvin Coburn; Morals and religion—N. O. Chaffee; Unity of God manifested in nature—Liberty Billings; Value of the Greek language to a minister—Stillman Barber; Justin Martyr—R. R. Shippen; The Hebrew language—James Elliott; Authenticity of the Pentateuch—Daniel Boyer; Paul on Mars Hill—E. P. Bond; The importance of a new translation of the Bible—Peter Betsch; The foundation of confidence in the Saviour—Dolenna Barnes; Hebrew poetry—G. S. Ball; A permanent ministry—C. G. Ward; The pastor—F. R. Newell; The pulpit—G. T. Hill. We cannot but notice the variety in the subjects of these essays,—indicating the extent of ground over which the Professors conduct their pupils; and the Visitors remark, that “it is evident there has been thorough and systematic instruction, and laborious study. The students have clear views of fundamental principles, and when it is considered that many of them came to the School with but little preparatory discipline, their performances seem the more remarkable; all of them were respectable, and some of them were excellent.” The central position of the School has a tendency to “draw students from all directions—nine from New England, two from Illinois, six from Pennsylvania, four from Ohio, and two from New York. The students are also of different denominations—Unitarians, Christians, and Methodists.” The library contains about two thousand volumes; in addition to which there are about nine hundred text-books for the use of the students. Some funds have been obtained for the support of the institution, and the expenses of the students are made as low as possible. Three having completed their course of study with the last year, have left the School for their chosen work, and a large class is expected to enter the next term. Indeed, everything in the history and prospects of this institution is such as to give the greatest gratification to its friends.

Unitarian Association of the State of New York.—This body held its first series of public meetings in May, 1846. On Monday evening, May 11, the Association met in the hall over the vestibule of the First Unitarian church, and the President having taken the chair, resolutions were offered concerning the progress of just opinion in the State, the importance of circulating Unitarian publications and establishing a religious newspaper, the attention which should be given to missions, and the interest felt in the Meadville Theological School. Several gentlemen spoke upon these points, and the resolutions were adopted. On Tuesday evening a sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Dewey of New York in the church of the Divine Unity, from 1 Timothy vi. 20, on the application of the principles of the inductive philosophy to the statement and exposition of Christian doctrine. On Wednesday evening a sermon was preached in the same church by Rev. Mr. Osgood of Providence, R. I., from Galatians v. 1, on the position and prospects of Unitarian Christianity. On Thursday evening a meeting for discussion was held in the church, when remarks were made,—founded on resolutions similar in character to those presented on Monday evening,—by Rev. Dr. Dewey, Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Troy, Hon. Mr. Jenkins of Vernon, Rev. Mr. Hosmer of Buffalo, Rev. Mr. Farley of Brooklyn, Rev. Mr. Holland of Rochester,

Rev. Mr. Taylor of Boston, Mass., and Rev. Mr. Conant of Geneva, Ill. The resolutions were then adopted, and the assembly retired at a late hour. The meetings were attended with great satisfaction by those most interested in their success, and the Association gives promise of efficient action.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.—The twenty-first annual meeting of this Society was held in London, June 3, 1846. The anniversary sermon was preached in the Essex Street chapel by Rev. J. G. Robberds of Manchester, from Matthew iv. 19, and appears to have given general and great satisfaction. At the close of the religious services the meeting for business was opened, J. B. Estlin Esq. taking the chair. Mr. Hornby, the Treasurer, presented his Report, which exhibited the expenditures of the year as having rather exceeded £1,000, (\$5,000.) Rev. Edward Tagart, the Honorary Secretary, read the Report of the Committee who conduct the operations of the Society, which detailed the proceedings of the last year and suggested plans for an increased activity. The regular motions upon the acceptance of the Reports, the choice of officers, etc. were introduced by brief remarks from different gentlemen, after which a discussion of some interest arose on a resolution offered by Rev. Mr. Armstrong of Bristol, in reference to certain uncandid expressions used by the Bishop of Norwich at a recent meeting of the British and Foreign School Society; the debate ended in instructing the Committee of the Association to consider "what steps could be taken to secure that the schools of the B. and F. S. Society should be conducted upon the original, fundamental and comprehensive principles of the Society, without dogmatic teaching." A resolution was then adopted, approving of a measure similar to that which was the subject of much discussion at the late meeting of the American Unitarian Association, viz.

"That this meeting cordially approves the plan of appointing a travelling agent, being an educated and accomplished minister, well acquainted with the wants and character of the Unitarian body, to visit various churches and districts in the country, to preach, and make extensively known the plan and objects of the Association, and would urge it on the Committee to take immediate and efficient steps by the offer of adequate remuneration to obtain a well qualified individual for the office."

From the meeting in the chapel the members of the Association retired to the Crown and Anchor Tavern, to partake of the annual "dejeuner." About three hundred ladies and gentlemen were seated at the tables. A blessing was sought by Rev. Mr. Robberds, and thanks were returned by Rev. Mr. Armstrong. The chair was taken by Charles Paget Esq., who after the regular toasts,—"the Queen"—"the Royal Family"—"Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over,"—called on gentlemen to speak in support of "sentiments" which had been prepared for the occasion. Speeches were made by Thomas Hornby Esq., Rev. Mr. Hutton of Birmingham, Rev. Mr. Talbot of Tenterden, Rev. Mr. Robberds of Manchester, Mr. James Yates of London, Rev. Mr. Tagart of London, Rev. Mr. Armstrong of Bristol, Rev. Mr. Gordon of Coventry, Rev. Thomas Cooper, Rev. Dr. Hutton of London, and Mr. H. C. Robinson. The "assemblage then separated, shortly after 8 o'clock, apparently highly gratified at the result of the proceedings."

Sunday School Association, (in England.)—The twelfth anniversary of this Association was celebrated in London by a public "breakfast" on Thursday morning, June 4, 1846. The chair was taken by J. W. Dowson Esq. of Norwich, and after the reading of the Annual Report by the Secretary, Rev. Mr. Vidler of London, brief, but spirited addresses were made by several gentlemen. The *Christian Reformer* gives the following summary of intelligence communicated in the Report.

"In the 123 Schools from which returns have been received, there are 12,618 children and 2,395 teachers; to nearly all of them there are week-evening classes, libraries, saving funds, or other connected institutions. Six schools made returns last year, and have not done so this; in these schools there were then 747 children, and 86 teachers. If these numbers be added to those of the preceding schools, the gross total of the 129 schools would be 13,365 children and 2,481 teachers; leaving 29 schools of which the existence is known, but from which there is no numerical return. This is a large increase on the summary of last year, which, taken on the same plan, was 11,594 children and 2,058 teachers."

No one appears to have been present from the United States, but the last year, (as we should have been glad to notice at the time,) the Chairman, Rev. Mr. James of Bristol, offered the following sentiment:—"That this meeting desires to give a cordial welcome to Rev. Mr. Simmons of America, and to express its best wishes for the success of our brethren in Boston, who are laboring with such distinguished success in the field of Sunday School instruction;"—to which Mr. Simmons made a brief reply.

Installation.—Rev. THOMAS TREADWELL STONE, late pastor of a church in Machias, Me., was inducted into office as the Minister of the First Church in SALEM, Mass., on Sunday, July 12, 1846. The church preferred in this instance to return to the principle of lay ordination asserted at the commencement of their ecclesiastical history, and induct their own minister, without the assistance of other clergymen. George Choate M. D., in behalf of the Standing Committee, addressed the congregation in explanation of the course they had adopted, and then, after extending to Mr. Stone the right hand of their fellowship, charged him to be faithful in his ministerial relations. Mr. Stone made a brief reply, accepting the service to which they had called him. After which he was introduced into the pulpit, and the usual services of the Lord's day were conducted by Mr. Stone, with a special reference to the peculiar character of the occasion.

Dedications.—The Chapel erected for the Ministry at large in PROVIDENCE, R. I., was dedicated by appropriate religious services, (in connexion with the Ordination of Rev. Mr. Babcock,) April 8, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hall of Providence, from Revelation xxii. 17, (not xx. 17, as erroneously printed in our May number;) and the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Osgood of Providence.

The "Church of the Saviour" erected by the First Unitarian Congregational Society in HARTFORD, Conn., was dedicated April 22, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Harrington, pastor of the society, (whose installation took place on the next day,) from

2 Chronicles vii. 16; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Farley of Norwich, Conn., Ellis of Northampton, and Harrington of Albany, N. Y.

The "Church of the Unity" erected by the Second Unitarian Society in WORCESTER, Mass., was dedicated April 28, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Dewey of New York, from Ephesians iv. 16; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Clarke of Uxbridge, Hale of Worcester, (whose ordination as pastor of the church took place on the next day,) and Willson of Grafton.

The Mount Pleasant Congregational Church in ROXBURY, Mass., was dedicated July 29, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury, from Ezekiel xlviii. 10; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Hall of Dorchester; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston, and Rev. Dr. Putnam.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

New Works.—We have found it impossible to furnish in our successive numbers such information in regard to the appearance or preparation of new works, either religious or literary, as we hoped to give when we included this department in the plan of our journal. The few pages which alone we can devote to "Intelligence," with the constant accumulation of that which falls under the head of "religious," will not allow us to present anything like a regular or complete announcement of the contributions which the press is continually making to the literature of our times, even in our own neighborhood. A multitude of books, of which a considerable part are really valuable, are reprinted here, and others of not inferior character are given to the public by American writers, but we are obliged to let them pass by as if we were ignorant even of their titles. We endeavor to include within our Notices some mention of every volume or pamphlet proceeding from our own denomination, or bearing on the great questions at issue between us and other bodies of Christians; and this, with occasional notices of such other works as may come under our eye, occupies all the room at our command. The same want of space has compelled us to omit that review of the political history of our times which we had once hoped to give in the Examiner, and which seems to us to belong to a journal whose purpose it is, to consider the character of the present period, in the world of action as well as of thought, as it appears under the light of Christian truth. We say this once for all, as an excuse for past deficiencies, and as an explanation of the incompleteness which must continue to mark our record of Intelligence. The necessity under which we have often been placed, of postponing, and afterwards throwing aside, matter which we had wished to publish when it would not be altogether stale, has taught us to reduce our expectations for the future. We shall be satisfied, if we can preserve a faithful record of whatever of importance takes place within our own body.

Among the volumes which have lately come from the press, we may mention as of special value the "Works of Henry Ware Jr., D. D.,"

issued by James Munroe & Co. of this city. The two volumes which have been published contain his miscellaneous writings, in prose and poetry, the greater part of which are already well known, but will be welcomed again in this permanent and well printed collection of his works. A third volume will contain sermons, most of which have never before been printed; and if sufficient materials should remain for a fourth volume, it will follow. We shall endeavor to take proper notice of the whole, when concluded. — C. S. Francis & Co. of New York have commenced another important publication — the “Works of Rev. Orville Dewey, D. D.,” the first volume of which contains Discourses and Reviews upon Questions in Controversial Theology and Practical Religion, some of which have never before been printed. We shall notice this volume hereafter. — We are glad to announce the publication of a volume of Miscellaneous Writings of the late Rev. Dr. Greenwood, compiled principally from journals and letters. — We learn with pleasure that a new edition of Noyes’s Translation of the Psalms is in press, with extended Notes. — Messrs. Ticknor & Co. of Boston have reprinted, in two very neat volumes, Motherwell’s “Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern,” with an Historical Introduction by the editor, which fills nearly half of the first volume and adds much to the value of the work. — From the same publishing house we have received a reprint of Richard Monckton Milnes’s “Poems of many Years,” which will be acceptable to the lovers of modern English poetry of the purest kind. The style in which these publishers reprint choice works of elegant literature deserves commendation. — We cannot speak so approvingly of an edition of Shelley’s Poetical Works, issued by a New York house, and edited by G. G. Foster, who has prefixed a biographical and critical preface. It is said to be the only complete edition of Shelley that has appeared in this country, and is neatly printed, but on a type altogether too small for comfortable reading.

From London journals lately received we learn, that a volume to which we referred in the last number of the Examiner as in preparation has appeared, — under the title of “Unitarianism Exhibited in its actual Condition; consisting of Essays by several Unitarian Ministers and others, illustrative of the Rise, Progress and Principles of Christian Anti-Trinitarianism in different parts of the World. Edited by Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D.” We shall look for its arrival in this country with interest. — We observe with pleasure the issue of proposals for publishing “Principles of Textual Criticism, with their application to the Text of the Old and New Testaments. By J. Scott Porter, Professor of Scripture Criticism and General Theology in the Royal Belfast Academical Institution.” Such a work, executed as we believe it will be by Mr. Porter, we should esteem a valuable addition to the means of theological education. “It has been undertaken to supply a defect in English theological literature which many students have felt, and of which not a few have complained.” It “will be put to press as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers have been procured, and will form an 8vo. volume of ordinary size.” — We are exceedingly gratified to find that the Messrs. Chapman of London propose to publish a cheap edition of Mr. Norton’s “Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.” The three volumes of the American edition will be comprised “in two handsome volumes, demy 8vo., bound in cloth,” and will be furnished to subscrib-

ers at fifteen shillings, or about three dollars and a half, a copy. The publishers announce that "there will be about fifty pages of new matter in the first volume, and this edition of the work will embody throughout various alterations and corrections made by the author at the present time."

Serial Works.—While the impure tastes of a certain—we fear, a large—class of readers are fed by the publication of numberless cheap tales which are sold at railroad and "periodical depots," and a vast amount of miserable fiction imported from abroad is reprinted here, it is but an act of justice, if gratitude did not impel us, to acknowledge the efforts of those publishers who are engaged in issuing series of works of a more profitable and substantial character, in volumes fairly printed and sold at a moderate price. Several such series are before us, and if they can all be sustained, the number of readers in this country is even greater than we had supposed. These "serial" publications include of course works of unequal merit, partly original, but mostly such volumes as have met with a favorable reception in former editions or have lately appeared in England. Wiley and Putnam's "Library of Choice Reading," published in New York, has reached the lxvith number, and consists entirely of reprints of English books; beginning with "Eothen," a very pleasant book of Eastern travels, and comprising other equally agreeable volumes by Hazlitt, Tupper, Dickens, and many others; while their "Library of American Books" is confined to the productions of our own writers, the last of which is Hawthorne's Mosses from an Old Manse. Appleton & Co. of New York have given in their "Literary Miscellany" still more choice works, such as translations of Michelet's Life of Luther, and his Histories of France and the Roman Republic, Gilfillan's Sketches of Modern Literature, Guizot's Histories of the English Revolution and of Civilization in Europe, etc. Harper's "Family Library," after reaching the clxxiiiird number, has been succeeded by their "New Miscellany of Sterling Popular Literature," which includes Whewell's Elements of Morality and Polity, Holmes's Life of Mozart, etc. J. W. Moore of Philadelphia has commenced a "Select Library," of which only four numbers have appeared, but which promises to furnish instructive reading. In this city Francis & Co. are issuing a "Cabinet Library of Choice Prose and Poetry," in which have already appeared Mrs. Child's History of the Condition of Women and Biographies of Good Wives, Mrs. Norton's Poems, Memoir of Mrs. Hemans, Talfourd's Tragedies, Moore's Lalla Rookh, and Tuckerman's Thoughts on the Poets, noticed in this number of the Examiner. J. Munroe & Co. have published the Second Series of R. W. Emerson's Essays as the first number of the "Boston Library of American and Foreign Literature." Saxton & Kelt, in their "Library of Select Literature," have given Wilson's tales of Margaret Lyndsay etc., and Tupper's Geraldine.—Here is a sufficient amount of good reading, if our people are disposed to spend a part of their time in the cultivation of intellectual and moral tastes. We should be glad, however, if there were one series of "books for the people," which included works of a decidedly religious character. Why should religious books always constitute a class by themselves? Religion has its literature, and literature can never be complete without religion. Let them appear as friends and allies, not as having separate interests and separate provinces.